

PO  
149  
M 4  
56  
S  
6  
206



CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

PQ  
1496  
M42  
S69

Cornell University Library  
**PQ 1496.M42S69**

Structure of *Le livre d'Artus*.



3 1924 027 302 474

010



# Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.

THE STRUCTURE OF  
LE LIVRE D'ARTUS  
AND ITS FUNCTION IN THE  
EVOLUTION OF THE ARTHURIAN  
PROSE-ROMANCES

A Critical Study in Mediæval Literature by  
H. OSKAR SOMMER

HACHETTE AND COMPANY  
LONDON: 18 KING WILLIAM STREET, CHARING CROSS  
PARIS: 79 BOULEVARD SAINT-GERMAIN

1914



THE STRUCTURE OF  
LE LIVRE D'ARTUS  
AND ITS FUNCTION IN THE  
EVOLUTION OF THE ARTHURIAN  
PROSE-ROMANCES

A Critical Study in Mediæval Literature by  
H. OSKAR SOMMER

HACHETTE AND COMPANY  
LONDON: 18 KING WILLIAM STREET, CHARING CROSS  
PARIS: 79 BOULEVARD SAINT-GERMAIN

1914

A.298671

TO  
MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE  
A TOKEN OF GRATITUDE  
FOR HAVING INDIRECTLY ENABLED ME  
TO ACHIEVE THE PROGRESS RECORDED  
IN THESE PAGES



## THE STRUCTURE OF LE LIVRE D'ARTUS<sup>1</sup> AND ITS FUNCTION IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE ARTHURIAN PROSE-ROMANCES

PAULIN PARIS was the first to give the title *Le Livre d'Artus* quite appropriately to the Vulgate-*Merlin*, the link which figures in the Vulgate-Cycle between Robert de Borron's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot*, and he also applied it to the unique second part of the MS. No. 337<sup>2</sup> of the Bibliothèque Nationale. In the present monograph *Le Livre d'Artus*, whenever this term is used, has a much wider sense, and refers to a huge compilation from which both the link in the Vulgate-Cycle, the second part of the MS. No. 337, and what is missing at the beginning of the former and at the end of the latter, ultimately descend.

The MS. français No. 337, one of the earliest known of the MSS. of the Arthurian prose-romances, consists of two distinctly different parts which were arbitrarily united by a scribe, when the *Lancelot* had reached the last stage in its development, *i.e.* the one familiar to all scholars from the numerous MSS. of the Vulgate-Cycle. Part I., or fols. 1-115, correspond to exactly two-thirds of the early history of King Artus, as it is found intercalated between Robert de Borron's *Merlin* and the beginning of the *Lancelot*. For the sake of clearness

<sup>1</sup> I had promised in 1909 to write an article on the subject of *Le Livre d'Artus* for *Romania*. I fulfilled my promise in the first week of the present year. Paul Meyer kindly sent my MS. to *Romania*. The director, being overwhelmed with work, could not find the time to read it till February 24th when he wrote to accept the article, if I consented to wait till July and to carry out some slight formal alterations in my MS. I have rearranged and expanded what I had written, but decided to publish it separately rather than wait, as my ill-health last year had already so considerably delayed its appearance.

<sup>2</sup> The MS. No. 337 (Size 37.25 × 26.5 centimeter) was written during the last quarter of the thirteenth century (with the exception of fols. 93-96) by one hand, on vellum, in double columns of 45, in a few cases of 44 or 46 lines. It, probably, formed part of a set of volumes embodying the whole of the Vulgate-Cycle. Spaces for three- or, in a few cases, for two-line initials are left throughout; only on fols. 1-124, completely, and on fols. 145-152, partly, are the initials filled in.

and to avoid the use of the term *Le Livre d'Artus*, except in the above stated sense, I shall call Part I. *Fragment I.* Part II. of the MS. No. 337, or fols. 115-294, *minus* fols. 251b-254d and 287a-290d, containing the translation of a Latin version of the Gospel of Nicodemus or *Acta Pilati*, and fols. 256d-258a, containing a description of l'Isle Tournoiant, borrowed from *Lestoire del Saint Graal*, represent all that is left of another version of the early history of King Artus; this I shall call *Fragment II.* An edition of *Fragment II.*, the importance of which already W. Foerster<sup>1</sup> realised, but which no scholar before me has recognised, was for nearly four decades a *desideratum*. I have rendered it accessible to all scholars in the seventh, supplementary, volume of my *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington between 1908 and 1913, on the general analytical Index to which I am now working. I had intended to publish simultaneously with the text<sup>2</sup> the results of my studies on the contents of the MS. No. 337, but ill-health, enforcing complete abstention from all mental work for six months, has frustrated my plan. The present monograph is the tardy realisation of my intentions.

Three scholars have dealt with the MS. No. 337 before me. Paulin Paris<sup>3</sup> and E. Freymond<sup>4</sup> have both devoted much time and

<sup>1</sup> *Litteraturblatt*, xi. c. 268 f. and in his *Erec* edition p. xxxvii, etc.

<sup>2</sup> All who know the Arthurian prose-romances and are familiar with the literature recording the various attempts which have been made to explore this vast *domaine* of Mediæval Literature, cannot have failed to recognise from my foot-notes to this volume, that I had correctly gauged the importance of the MS. No. 337 to the critic, and acted deliberately and judiciously when I decided to edit it as a supplement to the Vulgate-Cycle; some will also have guessed what direction my studies of the text would take, but probably not one had the slightest idea what results they would lead to.

<sup>3</sup> Paulin Paris has written an analysis of the contents of the whole of the Vulgate-*Merlin*, it forms as *Le Roi Artus* the greater part (pp. 101-389) of vol. ii. of his *Les Romans de la Table Ronde*, etc. Paris, 1868-1877, 5 vols. 8vo. Now and then P. Paris has written the numbers of the leaves of the MS. No. 747, the basis of his analysis, on the margin of the MS. No. 337. That P. Paris has attentively read Part II. of the MS. No. 337 is shown: first, by the numerous notes he added in ink on the margins, and even between the two columns, of the fols. of the MS.; second, by the fact that he was the first to discover that the leaves of the MS. after fol. 254 are wrongly bound, and indicated in his handwriting their correct order; third, by various notes about and references to incidents narrated in Part II. in the second, third, and fourth volumes of his *Les Romans*, etc.

<sup>4</sup> E. Freymond has not only seen the MS. No. 337 at the Bibliothèque Nationale, but the authorities of that library have sent the volume for his use both to Heidelberg and Bern. That E. Freymond has carefully read Part II. is proved by his analysis of its contents. He also gives an abstract of the contents of the Vulgate-

thought to the study of its contents and have spared no trouble to understand the lesson it teaches. Of W. E. Mead<sup>1</sup> I may say that he, at least, turned over the leaves of the MS. when he endeavoured to trace the French original of the English translation represented by the MS. in the Cambridge University Library. In spite of all their efforts, however, P. Paris and E. Freymond have failed<sup>2</sup> to thread the intricate maze, and neither has succeeded in mastering the contents of the ponderous volume so far as to be able to answer the fundamental question : In which relationship do *Fragments I. and II.*, the two parts of the MS. No. 337, stand to one another ? Their failure in this respect has barred them from reaping the reward of their labours, for it has precluded them from realising the great critical value of the material forming *Fragment II.*, and last, not least, it has rendered it impossible for both to assign to the voluminous work—of which this material is but a comparatively small fragment and a later *rifacimento*—the part it played in the evolution of the Arthurian prose-romances, and the proper place it occupied in the history of the French literature of the Middle Ages.

*Merlin.* The results of his studies on this subject are to be found in two articles : firstly, *Zum Livre d'Artus* in vol. xvi. (1892), Heft 1 and 2 der *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, pp. 90-128 ; secondly, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altfranzösischen Artus-Romane in Prosa*, in vol. xvii. (1895), Heft 1 and 3 der *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, pp. 1-128.

<sup>1</sup> W. E. Mead, *Outlines of the History of the Legend of Merlin* (1899), forming Part IV. of *Merlin*, or *The Early History of King Arthur*, a prose-romance (about 1450-1460 A.D.), edited from the unique MS. in the University Library, Cambridge, by Henry B. Wheatley for the Early English Text Society between 1865 and 1869. A glance at pp. cxlvii-c1 of Mead's volume will show the reader that I have not underrated what he has done.

<sup>2</sup> In speaking of 'cette rédaction particulière,' i.e. Part II. of the MS. No. 337 in vol. ii. *Les Romans*, etc., p. 397, P. Paris describes it as 'toute confuse tout indigeste,' but then, intuitively feeling the truth, he goes on : 'tout inachevée qu'elle semble être avait dû précéder la composition du *Lancelot du Lac*, et peut en avoir été la première inspiration ?' E. Freymond remarks on the same subject in his first article (conf. note 4 above), p. 92 : 'An die Frage, welche Stelle man dieser Kompilation in dem umfangreichen Prosaroman-Cyklus anzuweisen hat, resp. wie sich derselbe zur vulgata des *Livre d'Artus* verhält, knüpfen sich eine Reihe anderer Fragen, die G. Paris voraussichtlich lösen wird, zumal ihm der grössere Teil des dazugehörigen, freilich sehr weitschweifigen Materials leicht zugänglich ist. Jedenfalls erschweren einige, in den betreffenden Texten sich findende, Widersprüche die Beantwortung dieser Fragen,' etc. Beyond the note 2 on p. xxiv cf his Introduction to the *Huth-Merlin* : 'Le MS. de la B.N. fr. 337 contient du "livre d'Arthur" une rédaction qui, à partir d'un certain endroit, diffère complètement de la vulgate. Cette rédaction sera publiée par la *Société des anciens textes* et donnera l'occasion d'étudier différentes questions qui ne peuvent être abordées ici. Elle n'a, d'ailleurs, aucun rapport avec celle du MS. Huth,' I do not know any other occasion on which Gaston Paris spoke about the MS. No. 337.

I have on three previous occasions briefly expressed my views on the problem which the MS. No. 337 presents :

Firstly, in volume xxxii. (1908) of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, page 323, note 3 : 'Teil II. der Hs. 337, der mich schon seit Jahren bei jedem Besuche der National-Bibliothek beschäftigt hat, habe ich im vorigen Jahre photographieren lassen, nachdem Paul Meyer so freundlich war, mir die Versicherung zu geben, dass, weder die *Société des Anciens Textes Français* vor der Hand eine Ausgabe desselben plane, noch, dass sich in Gaston Paris' hinterlassenen Papieren eine Abschrift davon befindet.—Teil II. den Paulin Paris bald für früher bald für später als den *Lancelot* hielt, so viel will ich hier kurz andeuten, hat mit dem, die *Vulgata* repräsentierenden Teil I., weiter nichts gemeinsam, als dass beide von einem Schreiber willkürlich vereinigte Teile von zu verschiedenen Zeiten unternommenen Bearbeitungen eines ursprünglichen *Merlin* sind, der sehr wohl den Namen *livre d'Artus* verdient. Diese Version nach der *Lancelot* noch nicht zur Tafelrunde gehörte, und die mit dem *Tode Artus* endete, wie er z. B. von Huchown erzählt wird, ist die Quelle vieler Episoden des *Lancelot* gewesen, und hat auch zusammen mit der *Perceval*-Queste, die ursprünglich mit dem *Lancelot* vereinigt war, das Quellenmaterial zum *Perceval li Gallois* gebildet,' etc.

Secondly, in my Introduction (1908) in the first volume of *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, page xx : 'When one carefully examines this fragment (I refer to *Fragment II.*), which, in the form found in the MS. No. 337 is adjusted to form part of the Vulgate-Cycle, one cannot help arriving at the conclusion that the whole romance, of which it only represents a part, was intended for the same purpose as the *Livre d'Artus*, viz. to bridge over the gap in the narrative between Robert's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot*, and that it is even more closely related to the latter than can be said to be the case with the *Livre d'Artus*. Certain points, which I hope to discuss later—when I shall have printed the whole of the *Lancelot* and of this fragment, and I shall be able to adduce the proof of my assertions by referring to pages and lines of the printed texts—render, in my belief, the hypothesis, highly probable, that this romance, either in its incomplete state or as a whole, already figured in the same capacity of link between Robert's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* in the cycle from which the Vulgate-Cycle sprang, and that it represents a first draught of the *Livre d'Artus*, which was abandoned in favour

of the *Livre d'Artus* itself, when the Vulgate-Cycle was formed, and for the preservation of which, in a modified form, we are indebted to the scribe of the MS. No. 337, or to the one whose manuscript he copied.'

'What I think of the relationship of the second part of the MS. No. 337 to its first part, *i.e.* to the *Livre d'Artus*, I have briefly stated in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* (vol. xxxii. page 323, note 3). In this explanation I have but to substitute for 'der ursprüngliche *Merlin*' an unsatisfactory and easily misleading but not incorrect term, the more definite description 'an account of the reigns of Uterpandragon and Arthur, different from any we possess'; for whatever this fragment, *minus* certain sections not belonging to it, may have been, whether it was always a fragment, if even a larger one than now, whether it ever figured or was only intended to figure as a link between Robert's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* in the cycle preceding the Vulgate-Cycle, it represents a far better adaptation of the same account as that given in the *Livre d'Artus* (the Vulgate-*Merlin* is of course meant), and the close relationship in which it stands to the *Lancelot* points unmistakably to the fact that the writer of the *Lancelot* knew this or a very similar account,' etc.

Thirdly, in a brief note, I prefixed to my edition of *Fragment II.* (1913), part of which runs as follows :

'*Le Livre d'Artus* is a fragment, being defective both at the beginning and at the end. It is not, as its place in the MS. No. 337 would suggest, a suite or continuation of the Vulgate-*Merlin*; both are—as I have for the first time asserted—*rédactions* of an account of the reigns of Uterpandragon and Artus made at different dates for the purpose of linking Robert's *Merlin* to the *Lancelot*. *Le Livre d'Artus*, at least the fragment of it before the reader, is more intimately related to the *Lancelot* than the Vulgate-*Merlin*.'

'In my opinion *Le Livre d'Artus* in its earlier form already figured in the *Joseph-Perceval-Lancelot-Cycle* as such a link, and markedly influenced the *Lancelot*. The present text is part of a later *rifacimento* added by some scribe to the Vulgate-Cycle, and—paradoxical as it may sound—it is considerably influenced by the *Lancelot*; it is interesting not only from a linguistic but also from a literary point of view, representing as it does earlier critical material of great value, although in a modified form.'

These statements, naturally very incomplete, afford nevertheless evidence that I have, from the very first, recognised the importance

of *Fragment II.* from a critical point of view, and correctly estimated the intimate relationship existing between *Fragments I. and II.* I have fortunately nothing to retract. My task it is now to adduce the necessary documentary evidence to prove my assertions, and to draw the conclusions to which the results of my labours unmistakably point.

No scholar, unless he was familiar with every line of the MS. No. 337, could ever hope to determine the relationship existing between the two fragments forming its contents. The best, and I think almost the only way to acquire such intimate knowledge of a romance filling 294 leaves of four columns each of a unique MS. of the thirteenth century, is the one in which I gained it, that is by transcribing the whole text with my own hands, preparing it for press and editing it. I have devoted a stupendous amount of time and labour to the study of the MS. No. 337, but my efforts have at least led to positive results.

As my subject is a very complex and intricate one, and as the necessity of extensive quotations from *Fragment I.* (not yet available in a printed edition) and, for the sake of comparison, from two other texts has caused the several sections of my treatise to be of unequal length, I deem it advisable to briefly indicate, what I am anxious to prove, and what conclusions, I think, I am entitled to draw from the facts I have established, to provide the reader, as it were, with a guide, to enable him to follow my line of thought. I desire to demonstrate that :

I. *Fragments I. and II.*, if a section relating certain events were intercalated between them, would form a coherent romance, allowance being made for small discrepancies owing to their different date.

II. *Fragment I.* contains ample proof that its continuation must have originally contained a number of episodes actually to be found in *Fragment II.* A comparison of the passages containing this evidence in *Fragment I.* with their equivalents in any two of the MSS. of the *Vulgate-Merlin* shows that *Fragment I.* and these MSS. go back to the same archetype.

III. Both *Fragments I. and II.* contain allusions to incidents, adventures, and events which must have been told in the continuation of *Fragment II.* which the MS. No. 337 does no longer contain.

IV. The Romance, the outlines of which I have indicated in

sections I., II., and III., contains evidence that it has already figured as a link between Robert de Borron's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* in the *Joseph-Lancelot-Perceval-Cycle*.

V. I am entitled from the facts I have established in sections I. to IV., to postulate the existence of a huge compilation which I call *Le Livre d'Artus*, and to point out what were, in all probability, the beginning and the end of it.

VI. *Le Livre d'Artus* was the stock on which *Le Livre de Lancelot* was grafted, and of which it has gradually absorbed a considerable portion.

VII. *Le Livre d'Artus* played a prominent part in the evolution of the Arthurian prose-romances, a part which it was compelled to cede step by step to *Le Livre de Lancelot*.

At the head of every one of the seven sections I have placed a number corresponding to the one in this guide and a brief title.

I. *The Correlation of Fragments I. and II.* Assuming that *Fragment I.* had not survived to our days, I will endeavour to glean from statements, references, and facts found in the opening chapters of *Fragment II.* what may reasonably be expected to have been the contents of the chapters preceding it. The figures I give refer to the pages of my edition of *Fragment II.*, they also, indirectly, refer to the beginnings of every one of the four columns of every leaf of the MS. No. 337, for I have indicated the latter throughout my text.

On page 3, at the very beginning of *Fragment II.*, Artus, the Companions of the Round Table, Gawain and his companions whoever they may be, and the Companions or Knights of Queen Guenever are mentioned.

Gawain and his companions must, therefore, already have joined Artus's court ; the Companions of the Round Table must have been already transferred to Artus ; Artus must have already married, as the Queen's Knights have been created. On the same page a peace is spoken of, on the conclusion of which Gawain and his companions were made Companions of the Round Table, and Gawain himself ' fu dilec en avant maistre & sire apelez de toz les compaignons de la Table Roonde.' As a peace generally terminates a war, a quarrel, or a dispute, we must infer that there had been unpleasantness of some kind or other between Gawain and his companions on the one hand and the Companions of the Round Table on the other. In line 30 of the same page we are told that during the rejoicings in celebration of this peace, news arrives that the Saxons have sur-

rounded Clarence, and that its inhabitants ask Artus as their liege-lord for help.

On page 4 Sagremor and Dodinel are mentioned by the side of Nascien and Adragain ; the former two must therefore already belong to Artus's *maisnie*. On the same page, line 29, Gawain is spoken of as the possessor of the wonderful horse Gringalet.

On page 6, line 39, the name of Artus's Queen is given ; it is therefore clear that he has married Guenever, the daughter of Leodegan. In line 48 of the same page, Gawain, mounted on the Gringalet (the name is implied here), ' feroit si granz cols d'Escalibor que nule armeure . . .' Escalibor being the sword which Artus, previous to his coronation, several times withdrew from the stone ; it is clear that it must somehow have come into Gawain's possession.

On pages 10-12 we find the rebel kings Brangorres, Belinans of Sorgales, his brother Tradelinanz of Norgales, Clarions of North-umberlande, Neutres of Garlot, Yders of Cornwall, Uriens of Gorre, and the Duke Escam of Cambenic, also King Loth of Orcanie, the father of Gawain, fighting with Artus, his allies Ban and Bohort, the Companions of the Round Table and the Knights of the Queen against the Saxons before Clarence, although later on we are told that the rebels, except Loth, have not yet done homage to Artus.

On page 13 Urfin, Bretel, and Jordain are mentioned ; Urfin is the faithful adviser of Uterpandragon, who together with Merlin helped him to realise his wishes concerning Ygerne. Bretel and Jordain are the two knights and confidants of Igerne's husband, Duke of Hoel. Merlin gives to Uterpandragon the semblance of the duke, to Urfin or Ulfin that of Jordain, and to himself that of Bretel, when they enter Tintaguel to deceive Ygerne. On the same page Kex is said to be the bearer of Artus's banner ; on this occasion, however, Merlin takes the banner out of Kex's hands and carries it himself.

On page 15 it is stated that the rebel kings and the duke (except Loth, who is not named) have not yet acknowledged Artus as their sovereign lord ; from the absence of Loth's name we may infer that he has already made his peace with Artus.

On page 17 Artus is said to draw the good sword ' que il toli au roi Rion.' Artus must therefore have previously fought and vanquished the king of Ireland.

On the same page Galeschin, the son of King Neutres of Garlot, is mentioned as being one of Artus's knights.

On page 18 Ywain le Granz, the son of King Urien of Gorre, and Gaheris, a brother of Gawain, are said to perform feats of valour as knights of Artus.

On page 19 King Loth is associated with Artus, his allies, knights, and auxiliaries in fighting the Saxons.

On page 20 Artus's indiscretion with the beautiful Lyzianor and the subsequent birth of Lohot are referred to when Arrans, the Saxon king, endeavours to get Lyzianor into his power.

On page 21 a fruitless attempt of Merlin to induce the rebel kings to make peace with Artus is recorded, and Merlin's failure is attributed to Urien's stubborn obstinacy. On the same page Eliezer is for the first time mentioned as Gawain's squire, taking care of Le Gringalet.

On pages 21 and 22 we learn from the list of knights who accompany Gawain that besides Sagremor, Dodinel, Ywain le Granz, Galeschin, and Gaheris already mentioned, the following have joined Artus's *maisnie* : Ywain li Avoutres, Agravain, Guerreliers, Giflez, Kex d'Estrans, Kehedins li Petiz, Kehedins li Biaus, Ywain aux Blanches Mains, Ywain de Cinel, Ywain de Lionel, and Ywain l'Esclain and many others.

On page 22 we are also informed that Eliezer, the squire of Gawain, is the son of King Pelles of Listenois.

On page 24 we are told that Artus invested his nephew Galeschin with the dukedom of Clarence.

On page 25 Artus invites the rebel kings to come into the city of Clarence. Urien is said to be incensed against Artus for having given Clarence to Galeschin and to vow vengeance ; King Neutres, Galeschin's father, on the contrary, is beginning to regret his hostile attitude towards Artus.

On page 27 a second great battle before Clarence is described, and the rebel kings and King Loth are said to fight on the side of Artus against the Saxons.

On page 29 Gosengos li damoisiaus de Tharmandaise, in whom Guenever takes an interest, is mentioned as a brave knight.

On page 35 Artus, his allies and the rebel kings leave Clarence and march to Vandeberes. Uriens leads the first division, Ydiers the second, Aguiscanz the third, Neutres the fourth, Loth the fifth, Karados the sixth, Brangorres the seventh, Belinans the eighth, Tradelinanz the ninth, the 'rois des .C. Chevaliers' the tenth, Clarions the eleventh, and Escaus the twelfth.

On page 50 the conversation between Loth and Gawain shows

distinctly that Loth has already become Artus's vassal, and one may infer from the words used by the father, that he was compelled to acknowledge Artus by his son.

On page 52 a dream of Artus is told, in which he sees how Kex deprived his son Lohot of a white bird. Lohot disappears from Artus's view in a mist which suddenly rises. Kex returns to court. After a while a knight (by the description given no other than Perceval) arrives and bids Artus ask Kex if he took the bird from Lohot. At last Kex owns that he has taken the bird.

On page 53, when Gawain speaks of the services he has rendered to Artus he declares : ' & neis mon pere li fis ge au pie venir & crier merci & prendre terre de luj si [com] uos meismes sauvez ' ; from this declaration it is clear that Gawain had forced his father to become Artus's vassal. On the same page Gawain mentions that through his persuasion all the rebels had now recognised Artus's suzerainty except Urien.

On page 60 and in several other places Blaise ' le maistre de Merlin ' is mentioned, to whom Merlin goes from time to time to report what has happened.

On page 153 Guenever is said to surprise the lovers Morgan and Guiomar.

Many other minor points<sup>1</sup> might be added to this list, but I think enough has been said to give the reader an idea what the contents of the chapters were that must have preceded the beginning of *Fragment II.*

Any one sufficiently acquainted with the contents of the *Vulgat Merlin* perusing this enumeration of references to events, incidents, and facts I have given here, will have no difficulty in recognising that, with the exception of three points, all and every one can be accounted for in that romance, and what is more, in the two-thirds of it which form *Fragment I.* The three points which cannot be explained by anything related therein are :

<sup>1</sup> As I have united the Index of *Le Livre d'Artus* with that of the six volumes representing the *Vulgat-Cycle*, for the deliberate purpose of demonstrating that most of the *dramatis personæ* of that romance also figure in the *Vulgat-Merlin* and in the *Lancelot*, although their names, especially those of many *supers*, are often sadly corrupted and disfigured beyond recognition—e.g. the name of the Saxon king Brannague in the MS. No. 337, Part II., occurs in the following variations in the MSS. A, B, and C, from which I quote passages : Banaigue, Bavaigne, Bamague, Bonegue, Bramangue, Branmague, Brangye, and Bernagne—and as I hope to publish my Index-volume in the course of the current year, I have here, to save space, refrained from adducing a good deal of first-rate evidence.

Firstly, Gawain's possession of the horse Gringalet.

Secondly, the appearance of Eliezer the son of King Pelles of Listenois as Gawain's squire.

Thirdly, the existence of the truce between Artus and the rebel kings (except Loth) which renders it possible for the latter, without having previously acknowledged Artus as their liege lord, and as his unvanquished enemies, to fight side by side with him and his knights against the Saxons, their common foe before the cities of Clarence and Vandeberes.

And what conclusion may be drawn from these facts? If a section, satisfactorily explaining these points (very much like the account of the mission of King Loth and his sons to the rebel kings, omitting, however, the knighting of Elyezer and some minor details, as told in the last third of the *Vulgate-Merlin*) were prefixed to *Fragment II.*, or what would have the same result, appended to *Fragment I.*, the whole text of the MS. No. 337—if due allowance is made for slight differences and discrepancies that owe their origin to the different date and pedigree of the MSS. from which the two parts descend—could very well, and does indeed form a coherent and continuous work deficient at the end.

II. *Allusions in Fragment I. to persons, incidents, and adventures in Fragment II.* My assertion that *Fragments I. and II.* were one day parts of a romance we no longer possess, is by no means a hypothesis or a fabrication of my imagination, it is a reality, supported by convincing and irrefutable evidence more or less clearly expressed in a number of passages in *Fragment I.* and in the MSS. of the *Vulgate-Merlin*, containing its equivalent, treasured at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the British Museum and elsewhere.

The most telling and striking of this evidence I will now adduce from three MSS. Firstly, from the Add. MS. 10292 (=A) at the British Museum, which I have edited in the second volume of *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*. Then, of course, from the MS. No. 337 (=B); and thirdly from the MS. in the Cambridge University Library (=C), which H. B. Wheatley has edited for the Early English Text Society. A and C I have selected for no other reason than their accessibility in printed editions, any other two or three MSS. would have served my purpose equally well. To enable the reader to see at a glance the salient points in each of the nine

quotations, these are printed in italics and the three passages are placed side by side in column form.

Firstly, King Nantres (Neutres, Nentres, Nextres, Ventres) of Garlot had married Blasine (Blaasine, Basyne), one of the daughters of Duke Hoel and Ygerne, later the wife of King Uterpandragon. They had one son named Galeschin. Concerning this son Galeschin, there occurs in the *Vulgate-Merlin* the following passage :

A

Add. MS. 10292, fol. 113b ; my edition, page 127

& la fame au roy Nantre fu seror au roy Artu de par sa mere Ygerne qui auoit este fille au duc Hoel de Tintael si ot anon Blasine. & de li ot li rois Nantres son fil qui puis fu compains de la Table Roonde. si fu noumes par son droit nom Galescin & fu puis dus de Clarence.

B

MS. No. 337, fol. 19c

& la fame au roi Neutre qui fu seur au roi Artu de par sa mere Yguerne qui fu fame au roi Vterpandragon & fame au duc Hoel de Tintaiuel qui engendra Blaasine qui fu fame au roi Neutre. & en ceste Blaasine engendra il son fil qui tant fu puis bons chevaliers & hardiz. car il fist puis tant si com li contes le uos deuisera ca auant quil fu des .ij. & .l. chevaliers qui furent de la Table Reonde des plus proisiez. & ot non par son droit non Galeschins *li dux de Clarence*. que li rois Artu li dona apres ce quil ot esposee sa fame la reine Guinieure.

C

MS. in the Cambridge University Library, fol. 60b ; ed. H. B. Wheatley, page 177

and the wif of kynge Ventres was suster to kynge Arthur on his moder side, Ygerne, that was wif to Vterpendragon, and wif also to Hoel, Duke of Tintagell, that he begat Basyne, the wif of kynge Ventres. And vpon this Basyne begate he his sone, that was so a gode a knyght and hardy, *as ye shall here herafter*, and how he was oon of the CCL knyghtes of Rounde Table, and oon of the moste preyed, and his right name was Galashyn, *the Duke of Clarence*, that the kynge Arthur hym yaf after he hadde wedded his wif Gonore.

This passage is very short in A, but fuller and of equal length in B and C. While A does not announce what is told later on in the story, but only says 'qui fu puis,' B and C state clearly, that later on will be told, how Galeschin distinguished himself and became one of the Companions of the Round Table and was made duke of Clarence by King Artus, after he had married Queen Guenever. These announcements refer to *Fragment II*.

Secondly, when Artus went to Thamelide to help King Leodegan, and to gain the hand of Guenever, he was accompanied by Merlin, Ban, Bohort, and thirty-nine brave knights. In the course of the war against the Saxons a great battle is fought in the neighbourhood of Carohaise, 'illuec le firent bien li xlij. compaignon si quil en fu

parle lorc tans apres lor mort en la terre & ens el pais . . . ' On this occasion the names of all these knights are given. The first nine names are the same in A, B, and C, viz. Ban, Bohort, Artus, Antors, Ulfín, Bretel, Keu, Lucans, and Giflet le fil Do.<sup>1</sup> The other names are as follows :

A	B	C
fol. 119 d, e, ed. page 148	fol. 29a, b	fol. 73a, ed. page 212
10. Mauruc de la Roche.	10. Marroz de la Roche.	10. Maret de la Roche.
11. Drians de la Forest.	11. Guinas li Blois.	11. Drias de la Forest Sauage.
12. Belyas li Amoureus.	12. Drianz de la Forest Sauuage.	12. Belias de Amerous of Maydons Castell.
13. Flandrins li Bres.	13. Belias li Amoreus du Chastel au Puceles.	13. Flaundryns le Bret.
14. Ladinas de Benoye.	14. Flandrins li Brez du Chastel au Dames.	14. Ladynas de Benoyk.
15. Amores li Bruns.	15. Ladinas de Benoye.	15. Amoret le Brun.
16. Aucalec li Rous.	16. Amoret le Brun.	16. Anticolas le Rous.
17. Blois del Casset.	17. Taulas li Cox.	17. Blois del Casset.
18. Bliobleris de Gaunes.	18. Bibliots de Casel.	18. Blioberis.
19. Canode.	19. Biblioberis.	19. Canade.
20. Meleaudon de Blois.	20. Canet de Carmurtin.	20. Meliadus le Bloys.
21. Ies Meladant.	21. Meliadue li Blois.	21. Aladan the Crespes.
22. Placides li Gais.	22. Madam li Crespes.	22. Placidas ly Gays.
23. Lampades de la Planoie.	23. Placides li Gais.	23. Leonpadys of the Playn.
24. Ieruais Lanches.	24. Plantalis[de] la Plagnie.	24. Ierohas Lenches.
25. Cristofles de la Roche Bise.	25. Zeroiais Lancheis.	25. Christofer de la Roche Byse.
26. Aiglins des Vaus.	26. Cristofles de [la] Roche Bise.	26. Ayglin des Vans.
27. Calogrenant.	27. Aiglins des Vax.	27. Calogreuaunt.
28. Agusale le Desire.	27. Kalogrenanz.	28. Aguysale de Desirouse.
29. Agraeuil le fil a la Sage Dame de la Forest Sans Retour.	29. Grisalus li Desreez.	29. Agresianx, the nevew of the Wise Lady of the Foreste Withoutte Retorne.
30. Cliacles lOrphenin.	30. Cliales lOrfennin.	30. Chalis the Orphenyn.
31. Kehedin li Biaus.	32. Guiuret de Lambale.	31. Gires de Lambal.
33. Meraugis de Portlegues.	33. Kaadins li Biaux.	32. Kehedin de Belly.
34. Gornains Cadrus.	34. Meraugis de Porlesguez.	33. Meranges de Porlenges.
35. Claries de Gaule.	35. Goruain Cadruc.	34. Gosnayns Cadrus.
36. Li Lais Hardis.	36. Clairoit li Chaus & Li Laiz Hardiz.	35. Clarias of Gaule.
37. Amadan lOrgueilous.	37. Madain lOrgueilleus.	36. The Lays Hardy.
38. Osenains Cuer Hardi.	38. Oseuain Cors Hardiz.	37. Anmadius the Proude.
39. Galesconde.	39. Galetconde.	38. Osenayn Cors Hardy.
40. Gales li Chaus.	40. Gales li Chaus.	39. Galescowde.
41. Blaaris li filleus au roy Bohort de Gaunes	41. Blaans li filleus au roi Bohorz de Gannes.	40. Gales.
42. Merlins.	42. Merlin.	41. Bleoris the sone of kynge Boors.
		42. Merlin.
		43. kynge Leodogian.

<sup>1</sup> The Scribe of B writes instead of Giflet le fils Do : Girflet Do de Carduel.

In these three columns the Arabic numbers before the names of the knights correspond to the ordinals used in the same places in the MSS. To enable the reader to see at a glance which form represents the name of any knight in each MS., I have placed his name, irrespective of the place he occupies in the list, on the same line in every column. A comparison of the three columns discloses a number of discrepancies, differences in the sequence of the names, omissions and errors, but, in spite of all these faults, the descent of every one of these lists from a common original is evident.

B gives his eleventh place to Guinas li Blois, a knight not mentioned by A and C, because, having given his thirty-sixth place to two knights Clairoit li Chaus and Li Laiz Hardiz, he was short of one knight.

A omits the name of Guivret de Lambale, filling the thirty-second place in B and the thirty-first in C, because he left out the number 32 altogether in his list.

The twenty-first knight in A owes his peculiar name Iesmeladant to the fact that one learned scribe combined the termination -iesme, used to mark ordinals, with a proper name.

Several names are quite different in each list, so *e.g.* Àucalec li Rous, Taulas li Cox, Anticolas li Rous; Lampades de la Planoie, Plantalis [de] la Plaigne, Leonpadis of the Playn. The 29th knight in A and C, the 31st in B deserves particular attention. In all three MSS. this knight is said to be a relative of 'la Sage Dame de la Forest sans Retour,' but while A describes him as her *son*, B and C speak of him as her *nephew*. In A his name is Agraveil, in C he is called Agresianx, in B alone the form Greu occurs. 'Greu or Grex le fils du roi d'Alenie' is in *Fragment II.*, the knight who achieves the adventure<sup>1</sup> of la Laide Semblance, but he is neither the *son* nor the *nephew* of 'la Sage Dame de la Forest Aventureuse,' but marries her beautiful niece.

The fact that *Fragments I. and II.* are so considerably at variance here, shows clearly that they are derived from different versions, and that the scribe was not aware of it.

Thirdly, King Aguiscant of Scotland marches with a large host against the Saxons who have invaded his territory, and plunder and burn wherever they go, and kill or drive the inhabitants to flight. The king, a very brave knight, leads the vanguard personally, and entrusts the leadership of his rearguard to his cousin Gaudin de Val

<sup>1</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 150-162.

Effroi. Concerning this knight Gaudin the MSS. say what follows :

A

fol. 124e, ed. page 164

& li rois Aguiscans se met deuant el premier front a tout viij<sup>m</sup>. hommes. & Gaudins de Val Esfroi faisoit lariere garde a tout. viij<sup>m</sup>. chevaliers qui iouene homme estoient & preus & seurs as armes, si estoient bien monte sor cheuaus fors & courans.

Cil Gaudins estoit cousins au roy Aguiscant de par sen pere. & il fist puis maintes beles proeecs deuant le chastel pour lamour a la damoisele de Branlanc quil voloit auoir a feme a force. & deuant la riche uile del Gaut Destroit qui tant fist a proisier tant que *Gaudin* le conquist par sa proece *si comme li contes deuisera encore sil est qui le vous die mais li lieus ni est ore mie.*

B

fol. 36c

si les conduisoit li rois Aguis-  
canz u premier chief deuant  
a tot. viij<sup>m</sup>. homes molt bien  
armes. & Gaudins de Ual  
Esfrois fu en lariere garde  
a tout. viij<sup>m</sup>. homes qui  
ioenes cheualiers estoit &  
bons as armes & seurs &  
cousins apres germains au  
roi Aguiscans de par son  
pere. Icist fist puis mainte  
bele cheualerie deuant le  
chastel ma damoisele Lore  
de Branlant quil uoloit  
auoir a force a fame. &  
deuant la riche uile qui  
tant fist a proisier du Gaut  
Destroit. tant que *Gau-  
uenez* li resqueust par sa  
proesce *einsi come li contes  
le uos deuisera ca auant car  
li leus nen est ores mie ainz  
retorne a parler du roi  
Aguiscant.*

C

fol. 82b, ed. page 237

and hem condited the  
kyng Anguysans in the  
formest fronte with viij<sup>m</sup>.  
that were yonge bachelers  
and hardy. This Gaudius  
was cosin germain to Aguysans  
on his fader side; and  
he dide after many feire  
chualries before the castell,  
for the damesell of Brulent,  
that he wolde haue hadde  
bc force to his wif, and was  
before the riche town that  
was so moche preised er  
that *Gaudius* in conquered  
by his prowesse, as the  
storie shall telle hereafter,  
for it is yet no tyme thereto,  
but returne to the kyng  
Aguysans of Scotlonde, that  
rode togeder, he and Gau-  
dius till thei fill amonge  
the forriours and . . .

As the words printed in italics show, all three MSS. announce, in unmistakable terms, that the story will later on tell what Gaudin does. In *Fragment II.*<sup>1</sup> we are told that Gaudin wishes to marry Lore de Branlant. She refuses to listen to him. He besieges her in her castle Gaut Destroit. Lore sends her sister to Artus and asks him to send her a knight to defend her against Gaudin. Gawain (who pretends to be Daguenet li Coars) succours Lore and vanquishes Gaudin. The scribes of A and C, or probably the one of some earlier MS., from which both ultimately descend, have confused this passage by reading Gaudin for Gawain. It is noteworthy that the names are all correctly given by A. In C, in addition to ascribing to Gaudin the conquest of the castle, he is described as fighting for the 'damesell of Brulent.'

<sup>1</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 84-108.

Fourthly, while Artus, Ban, and Bohort are at Carohaise, Merlin one day makes obscure prophesies. When the three kings urge him to explain what he means, he refuses, but declares that all he has predicted will happen during Artus's lifetime. While the four are speaking together, a messenger from King Leodegan enters and asks the allied kings to come to his master. This messenger is Guiomar, Leodegan's nephew, about whom the MSS. say:

A

fol. 140a, ed. page 215

si auoit a non Guiomar & estoit de leage de. xxvj. ans. & ce fu cil par qui li cheualier de la Table Roonde orent puis tant paine por la damage que la roine Genieure li fist des amors Morgain la<sup>1</sup> seror le roy Artu qui tant lama de grant amor que Genieure li aleua si grant blasme *comme li contes vous deuisera cha auant.* Mais ore lairons de ce a parler *iusqua vne autre fois que li contes nous i menra.*

B

fol. 58c.

& auoit non Guionmarz. si estoit molt iuenes daage come de. xv. anz. & ce fu cil par cui acoison li roiaumes de Logres ot<sup>2</sup> puis maint grant tribous. & par qui li cheualier de la Table Roonde orent puis maintes granz paines & mainz granz trauauz por le deuoii que Guenievres a cosine li fist des amors Morgant la Fee suer au roi Artu qui tant lama de grant amor por cui Guenievre fu puis si meslee a luj que cele li aleua de si granz blasmes *com li contes le uos deuisera ca auant.*

C

fol. 111a, ed. p. 316

and his name was Guyomar, and was . xxv. yere of age ; and this Guyomar caused afterwande the reame of Logres to be in grete trouble, by whom the knyghtes of the Rounde Table hadde after soche peyne and labour for the damage that the quene Gonnore hym dide, for the love of Morgain, the suster of kyng Arthur, that somoche hym loved that the quene arcisede so grete blame, *as the tale shall reherse hereafter whan the tyme cometh to speke of that matier.*

All three passages agree in stating that the story will later on speak about Guiomar, Morgan, and Guenever, and this statement does not only refer to another passage (which I shall quote later on) in *Fragment I.* but to an incident<sup>3</sup> told in *Fragment II.*, and to events told in the *Lancelot*.

Fifthly, in a great battle against King Rion the Knights of the Round Table, then still at Leodegan's court, do wonders. One of them distinguishes himself before all others. His name is Nascien, and he is a relative of King Pelles of Listenois. In reference to Nascien the MSS. state :

<sup>1</sup> MS. has ' le.'

<sup>2</sup> MS. has ' &.'

<sup>3</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 134-137.

A

fol. 142a, ed. page 221

Mais sour tous les autres le fist bien vns damoisiaus dont li contes doit moult bien parler car il ne fait mie a trespasser ains fait moult bien a rementeuoir dont il fu & comment il ot non. Car che fu .j. des millors cheualiers qui onques fust al tans le roy Vterpandragon ne al tans le roy Artu tant comme il [li] p[!]ot [a] mener eheualerie. *li conte des estoires dient* quil fu cousins germains Parcheual le Galois de par sa meire *dont li contes parlera cha auant car li lieus nen est ore mie.* car il fu fieux Hauingues qui fu de la seror Josep[h] qui fu feme espouse Bron qui .xvij. fieux ot dont la terre de Bertaigne fu puis enluminee & parent prochain Celidoine le fils al duc Nascien de Betique qui la grant merueille del Graal vit premierement. & si ert parent al roy Pelles de Listenois & a ses freres. icil ot non Nasciens. Icil Nasciens ot puis Lancelot dou Lac le fil au roy Ban de Benoyc en sa haillie dont li eontes vous deuisera toutes les estoires les vns apres les autres si comme eles auendront de iour en iour. Icil Nasciens que ie vous di si fu apeles Nasciens pour le due Nascien qui tant fu preudomme. & il fu puis de si hoine vie que quant il ot laisiet cheualerie quil deuint hermites. & nostre sires mist tant de grace en li quil deuint puis prestres messe cantant. &

B

fol. 61b

Mais sor toz eels qui bien le firent le fist bien uns damoisiaus dont li contes doit bien parler. car ne fait mie a trespasser que li contes ne doie bien eselarier qui il fu & coment il ot non. ear ce fu li uns des meilleurs cheualiers qui onques fust au tens le roi Uterpandragon. & au tens le roi Artu meismes tant eom il li plot a maintenir eheualerie. & *li contes des estoires dit* que il fu eosins germains Perceual le Galois. & de par sa mere *dom il parlera assez ca auant que li leus ni est ore mie.* & si dit li contes qui[l] fu bien prochien [parent] Ioseph dAbarimathie. car il fu filz de la fille a la fille Enhyngues la seror Iosep[h] qui fu espouse a Neseeuij qui .xij. fiz orent dont la Mendre Bretaigne fu puis enluminee. & paranz prochiens Celeydoine le fil au due Nascien dOrherique qui la grant merueille du Graal uit premierement. & si apartint moult de pres le roi Perles de Bristenois & ses freres. & cist ot puis maint ior en garde Galehat le fil Laneelot dom li eontes uos deuisera esclairiement toutes les eholes lune apres lautre si com eles auindrent de celuj ior. & cist Nasciens dont ge uos di si fu apelez einsi por amor du due Nascien qui tant fu preudome & puis fu de si bone uie quant il laissa cheualerie & il deuint hermites que nostre sires se baigna en lui tant quil deuint prestres messe

C

fol. 114b, page 326

But of alle other ther dide well a yonge knyght, that ought well to be rehersed in the storye, for he ought not to be foryeten but to be remembred what he was and what was his name, ffor he was the beste that euer was in the tyme of Vterpendragon and in the tyme of kynge Arthur, as longe as hym liked for to vse and to haunte chualarie.

*The storye seith that he was eosin germain vnto Perceual de Galoys vpon his moder side, of whom this booke shall speke hereafter whan the matier cometh thereto;* and also the boke seith that this knyght was nygh kyn to Ioseph Abarimathie, for he was the sone of Enhyngnes, the soster of Ioseph, that was wif wedded to Ebron, that hadde .xij. sones wherof the londe of Bretaigne was after enlumyned, and next cosin to Selydoyne, the sone of Duke Nascien de Bretign, that the grete merueile of the Graal saugh firste, and also apertened to kynge Pelles de Lytenoys and his brethren. This knyght hadde after Galaad, the sone of Launeelot, many a day in his kepinge wherof the boke shall reherse hereafter of alle thinges oon after another as thei fill day be day. This knyght of whom I haue so spoken was cleped Nascien ffor love of the duke Nascien, that was so noble a knyght, and he was after of so gode

A

si fu uirges & castes tant  
com il uesqui .& icesstu  
Nascien rauui puis li Saint  
Espris & lenporta ou tierch  
chiel ou il uit apertement  
le peire & le fil et le saint  
esprit. icil ot puis la Sainte  
Estoire en sa baillie & escrit  
de sa main propre par le  
commandement del Saint  
Maistre. & tant en escrist  
quil aiousta al liure Blaise  
qui par Merlin en fist ce  
quil en fist. Icil douna puis  
li riche conseil al roy Artu  
quant il estoit en peril de  
perdre sa terre al tans que  
Galehot<sup>1</sup> li sires des Lom  
taines Iles le guerroia al  
pooir de .xxx. rois quil  
auoit tous conquis. Mais  
atant se taist ore li contes  
de ces coeses raconter si  
retorne a conter tout mot  
a mot comment il lor auint  
en la bataille.

B

chantant. & il fu uirges  
& chastes tant com il  
uesquij. & li Sains Esperiz  
enporta cestuj u tierz ciel.  
ou li li mostra deuiseement  
le pere & le fil & le saint  
esperit. icist ot puis la  
riche estoire en sa baillie.  
& escrit de sa main propre  
par le commandement du  
Grant Maistre. & tant en a  
escrit quil laiosta au liure  
Blaise le Saint Hermite qui  
par Merlin en fist ce quil  
en fist. Icist dona puis le  
riche conseil au roi Artu  
quant il estoit en peril de  
perdre toute sa terre au  
tens que Galehaz li Sires des  
Estranges Isles le guerroia  
au pooir de .xxxix. rois que  
il auoit toz conquis. mais  
atant se taist ici li contes  
dels dices choses que plus  
nen uuelt ore raconter. car  
bien uos sera encores tout  
esclairie & conte mot a mot.  
si retorne a parler coment  
il lor auint en la bataille  
deuant la cite de Neblaie.<sup>2</sup>

C

lyvinge whan he hadde  
lefte chivalrie that he becom  
an hermyte; and oure lorde  
hym visited and loved so  
that he was a preste and  
seide messe and was also  
a mayden and chaste as  
longe as he leved; and  
this same knyght was after  
ravished be the Holy Goste  
into the thridde heuene,  
where he saugh apertely  
the fader, sone, and holy  
goste. This knyght hadde  
after the storie in his  
kepinge and wrote with his  
owne hande by com  
maundement of the grete  
maister; and that he dide  
write he anaxed to the  
booke that Blase wrote, the  
holy hermyte, by the tech  
inge of Merlin. This knyght  
yaf afterwarde, whan he  
was hermyte, the noble  
counseile to kynge Arthur  
whan he was in pereile to  
lese his londe, in the tym  
of Galehaut the lorde of  
the Fer Oute Yles, that  
werred vpon Arthur with the  
power of .xxx. kynges that  
he hadde alle conquered.  
But now resteth the tale  
to speke of thise thinges,  
and returneth to telle how  
thei dide in the bataile.

All three MSS., which agree fairly well here, state clearly that the story will have later on to say a good deal about Nascien. Nascien is not often mentioned in the *Fragment I.*, but many of the incidents foreshadowed in this passage are told in *Fragment II.*<sup>3</sup> B contains toward the end another reference to the *Lancelot*.

Sixthly, when the duel between Artus and Rion has lasted a long time, and Artus has disdainfully declined to surrender his arms and to go free, Rion asks him his name. Artus answers the giant's

<sup>1</sup> MS. has ' galios.'

<sup>2</sup> Cite de Daneblaise.

<sup>3</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 244-261.

question and then asks him who he is. Rion gives the following answer :

A

fol. 145b, ed. page 231

Ore saces de uerite que iou ai a non Rions & sui rois d'Ierlande. si tieng toute la terre iusquen la Terre des Pastures. & outre fust ele encore moie son i peust passer. mais on ni passera iamais tant comme La Laide Semblance en sera ostee. & cest une bone que Iudas i geta. & ce fu enseigne quil auoit la terre toute iusques la conquise. & li anehien dient que ia si tost ne sera cele figure ostee que les auentures del roialme de Logres ne commencheront a finer. Ore tai dit qui ie sui & comment iai a non mais . . .

B

fol. 65d

Or sachiez par uerite que ge ai non li Rois Rions d'Ierlande la Grant qui tient toute la terre iusqua la Terre des Pastures. & oltre fust ele moie eneoires se len i poist passer. mais nus ni passera iamais tant que La Laide Semblance sera ostee du flun que Iudas Machabeus i gita. & ce fu unes de ses bonnes por mostrer as genz que iusquilec auoit la terre eonquise. & li ancien home dient que ia si tost la figure ne sera ostee que les auentures du roiaume de Logres comenceront. & si couendra que cil qui len gitera lempot u goufre de Sathenie. si que iamais ne soit ueue a nul ior. car ele est ditel maniere que tout ice couient a<sup>1</sup> perillier que ele uoit as elz. or tai dit qui ge sujet. mais . . .

C

fol. 120a, page 341

I do the to wite that I am the kynge Rion of Iselonde, and of alle the londes vnto Pastures, and yet ferther yef a man myght ferther passe; but oon may neuer passe till that the lawes be broken that Iudas Makabeus ther sette, and as olde auncient seyn that thei shall neuer be hadde away till the auentures begynne in the reame of Logres of the Seynt Graall, and it behoveth hym to caste to the portes of the goulf of Sathanye that it be neuer seyn after, ffor it is so of soche maner, that so it moste be fallen. Now I haue tolde the what I am. But . . .

A comparison of the three passages shows that only B has preserved a passable version of Rion's answer as it must have occurred in the archetype. In A a few lines are omitted ; the translator of C has entirely misunderstood his original, with the result that his rendering is not intelligible. As to the passage itself I am of opinion that the compiler of *Fragment I.* made Rion the vehicle of these details, because he himself wished to refer to what he would tell later on, *i.e.* in *Fragment II.*,<sup>2</sup> about La Laide Semblance.

Seventhly, shortly before Artus vanquishes Rion, and conquers the giant's wonderful sword, he and three of his companions are very hard pressed by the Saxons and in great danger of being overpowered. One of Artus's companions is Adragais li Bruns, about whom the following passage is to be found in the *Fragment I.* :

<sup>1</sup> MS. 'apareillier.'

<sup>2</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 150-162.

A

fol. 146a, ed. page 234

& en ce quil se combatoit  
si auint que li rois Baufumes  
& li rois Maltaillies & li  
rois Minadap i soruindrent  
car li rois Artus & si troi  
compaignon les eneauchie-  
rent moult durement. dont  
li vns des compaignons  
estoit Nasciens & li autres  
Adragans & li tiers Herui  
de Riuel.

B

fol. 67a

& en ce quil se comba-  
toient en tel maniere. atant  
es uos trois rois fuiant dom  
li uns fu Mautailleiz & li  
autres Baufumez & li tiers  
Mordrap que .iiij. che-  
ualiers enchaucoint dure-  
ment dom li uns estoit li  
rois Artus. & li autres Nas-  
ciens & li tiers Adragais.  
& li quart le frere Madoc  
le Noir le bon cheualier de  
l'Isle Noire Tornoiant que  
Gauuenez le nies le roi  
Artu conquist puis a Estre-  
mores quant il tenoit en  
prison Galeschin son cousin  
le filz au roi Neutre le ior  
quil le vost pendre a unes  
forches tres desoz les murs  
de la uile en despit du roi  
Artu uoiant ses elz. qui  
auoit mis son siege deuant  
la uile quil uoloit auoir a  
force. & por ce que *li rois*  
*li auoit ocis un suen cosin*  
*a une pointe qui fu deuant*  
*la uile. si com li contes uos*  
*deuisera ca auant.*

C

fol. 121b, ed. page 345

And as thei thus foughтен  
Com fleynge Maltaillyet and  
Balfinne, and the kynge  
Mahidrap full faste, ffor  
ther com thre knyghtes  
that hem chaced with grete  
spede, wheroft that on was  
the kynge Arthur, and that  
other Nascien, and *Adra-  
gaysn li Bruns*, the brother  
of Madagot, the goode  
knyght of the Blake Yle  
Tournoye that Gawein, the  
nevew of kynge Arthur,  
after toke at Estremors,  
whan that he kepte in  
prison his cosin Galashin,  
that day that he wolde  
hym haue hanged vpon the  
walles of the town, in de-  
spite of kynge Arthur, be-  
fore his owne iyen, ffor  
that he hadde sege before  
town that he wolde haue  
take be strength, and for  
that *the kynge hadde slain*  
*oon of his nevewes at a*  
*poynt, that hadde be by-  
fore the town, as this boke*  
*shall tell yow more clerly*  
*hereafter, whan the mater*  
*cometh thereto.* The fourthe  
felowe that com after with  
these thre knyghtes was  
Hervy de Rivell . . .

A glance at these three quotations shows that while in A all traces of a reference to *Fragment II*.<sup>1</sup> are obliterated, and the bare name Adragan is given, both B and C state that the story will later on speak about Adragain, Galeschin, and Gawain, and in making this announcement they supply a passage of capital importance to the critic.

It is interesting to observe that the scribe of B, misunderstanding the MS. he copied, attributed to Madoc, Adragais' brother, what was said about that knight himself. B states that Adragais was incensed

<sup>1</sup> Conf. my edition, vol. vii. pp. 60-64, 69-73.

against Artus for having invested Estremores and for having killed his *cousin* in an engagement before the walls of the town. C agrees with B in giving these two reasons, but states that Artus killed the *nephew* of Adragais. The whole episode alluded to here forms the subject of several *laissez*s in *Fragment II.* Not Adragais but Raolais is, however, the name given to its principal figure, and he is styled 'le Vermeil Chevalier d'Estremores'; his brother is named Madoc or Mauduc le Noir de l'Isle Noire; and not Artus but Galeschin kills the *nephew* of the two brothers. Briefly this is what is told: Raolais has made a raid on 'le Chastel de Bedingan es marches de Tamelide' and carried off much loot. Artus, on learning of these depredations, hastens with a host to punish Raolais and lays siege to Estremores. During a skirmish before the town Galeschin kills Plaares, the nephew of the brothers, but has the misfortune to be carried into the town through the open gate by his bolting horse and thus to become Raolais's prisoner. To avenge his *nephew's* death Raolais threatens to hang Galeschin, Artus's *nephew*, but is with some difficulty persuaded to allow Gawain to fight for Galeschin's life. Gawain, following a boar too eagerly on the morning of the day appointed for the battle, is only enabled by the speed and endurance of his Gringalet to arrive in time for the duel. Raolais is vanquished and does Artus homage; Galeschin is saved; Madoc is disgusted with his brother for his submission to Artus and leaves the country.

Besides pointing to the existence of a romance in which the events forming the subject of *Fragments I. and II.* were told, this passage shows that both are derived from versions of that work representing different stages in its evolution. The version forming the basis of *Fragment II.* is undoubtedly earlier than that from which *Fragment I.* is derived, although the *rifacimento*<sup>1</sup> filling vols. 115-294 of the MS. No. 337 is certainly later, dating in fact from a time when the Vulgate-Cycle had assumed its final shape, the one in which it has come down to our time in the MSS. of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. What makes the mention of Adragais le Brun and Madoc le Noir in this passage still more interesting is the fact that both are not only mentioned in the last third of the Vulgate-*Merlin*, but also in Part I. of the *Lancelot*.

<sup>1</sup> To judge from several discrepancies in the narrative, existing in the part preceding the version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* up to fol. 251b and the one following it, which I have noted in my edition on pp. 261, note 9, 262, note 3, 268, note 5, and 269, note 2, it is possible that the two parts are derived, if not from different versions, from different MSS. of the same version.

In the last third of the *Vulgata-Merlin* we are told that one day three 'Chevaliers de la Roine Guenievre,' Sagremor, Galeschin, and Dodinel, 'sen alerent esbatre' into the adventurous 'Forest de l'Espine.' Three Companions of the Round Table disguise themselves and also ride into that forest, 'si desiroient moult a trover des Chevaliers la Roine por els esprover les uns as autres.' One of these three knights is Agravadain. This name is here, as on various other occasions, erroneously written for Adragain or Adragais. Agravadain des Vals de Galore is not related to Agradaïs le Brun. The passage in the MSS. runs thus :

A

fol. 188b, ed. page 374

Agravadains li freres Belias le Vermeil  
Cheualier d'Estremores qui puis guerroia  
moult le roi Artu.

C

fol. 200a, ed. page 561

Agrauandain the brother of Belynans the  
beste knyght d'Estramors that after werged  
the kynge Arthur.

In Part I. of *Le Livre de Lancelot* (conf. my edition, vol. iii. page 46) the friar who speaks to the unhappy sisters—queens Elaine and Evaine—at the Moustier Royal and then proceeds to Great Britain and reproaches Artus with having neglected to succour his vassals kings Ban and Bohort, is named Adragais li Bruns li freres Mador le Noir le bon chevalier de l'Isle Noire, and said to have been a brave knight of Uterpandragon. There is no doubt that, in spite of the confusion caused by the scribes of the MSS., Adragais is the same knight whom Artus besieged in Estremores and whom Gawain vanquished.

As both the *Vulgata-Merlin* and the *Lancelot* have the name Adragais or Adragain instead of Raolais, it is clear that the name in both cases is derived from a common source. If the version whence *Fragment I.* is derived is the same as that which formed the basis of the last third of the *Vulgata-Merlin*, and if both are later than the version from which *Fragment II.* descends, then the *Lancelot* must be later than that version. But on this point I shall speak later on.

Eighthly, at the point which corresponds to the very end of *Fragment I.*, after the description of the demeanour of Morgan and Guiomar, there occurs in the MSS. of the *Vulgata-Merlin* the following passage :

A

fol. 177c, ed. page 338

Si sentraeuillierent en  
moult grant amor. Car il

B

fol. 115a

Si sentraueillerent en si  
grant amor que puis dura

C

fol. 181a, ed. page 509

As thei that gretly it  
desired; ffor yef he were

A

lama & ele li plus. si demorerent cel soir longement ensamble & sentramerent lonctans que nus ne le sot. Mais puis le sot la roine Geniere *ensi comme li contes le vous deuisera cha auant* par quoi il furent departi. dont Morgains lenhai si que puis li fist asses danui & de blasmes. si li esleua tel blasme que ainques puis ne li chai tant com ele uesqui. Mais atant sen taist li contes que plus nen parole chi endroit.

B

molt longuement. & demorerent ce soir ensemble. si demenerent en tel maniere lone tans lor amors entre Guiomar & Morgain conques nus ne sen aparcut fors solement la roine *ensi com li contes le uos deuisera*. par cui il furent puis departi dont Morgue enhai tant la roine que puis len fist assez de granz contraires & granz blasmes li aleua qui onques puis ne li chairent tant com ele uesqui . . .

C

desirouse she was yet moche more, so that thei loved hertely togeder longe tyme that noon it wiste; but after it knewe the quene Gonnore *as ye shull here telle*, wherfore thei were departed, and therfore she hated the quene, and dide hir after gret annoye, and of blames that she areised that euer endured while hir lif lasted . . .

As I have stated on page 16 *supra*, the passage No. 4 does not only refer to the one just quoted, describing the meeting of the lovers, but also to what is told in *Fragment II.* and in the *Lancelot*.

A, B, and C agree in announcing that the story will later on tell how Guenever will discover the guilt of Morgan and Guiomar and put a stop to their liaison; also that Morgan will ever after hate the queen and cause her trouble as long as she lives.

Ninthly, after speaking of Sagremor's birth and parentage, *Fragment II.* and the MSS. containing its equivalent continue :

A

fol. 114d, ed. page 132

si lapeloient la gent Saigremor liquels fist puis mainte haute proece el roialme de Logres *dont li contes vous deuisera cha auant*.

B

fol. 21d

si lapeloient les genz par son droit non Sagremoret. icist Sagremoret dont ge uos di fist puis mainte proesce u roiaume de Logres *dont li contes uos parlera: encore ca auant*.

C

fol. 63b, ed. page 186

and his right name was Segramore. This Segramore that I of speke dide afterwarde many high prowesse in the reame of Logres *wherof the tale shall declare yow hereafter*.

While Sagremor plays but a secondary part in *Fragment I.*, he is the hero of a series of important adventures in *Fragment II.*

So far the evidence I have to adduce from *Fragment I.* and MSS. of the *Vulgate-Merlin* in support of my assertion, that the contents of the MS. No. 337, if a chapter or two were intercalated between *Fragnents I. and II.* accounting for Gawain's possession of his Gringalet, Eliezer's appearance as Gawain's squire, and the truce between Artus and the rebel kings, would form the *torso* of a romance we no longer possess. As *Fragment I.* has apparently undergone less

drastical changes than *Fragment II.*,<sup>1</sup> the former appears to be a truer rendering of its original equivalent than the latter.

III. *Allusions in Fragments I. and II. to persons, incidents, and adventures figuring in the continuation of Fragment II. missing from the MS. No. 337.* The MS. No. 337 breaks off at the very beginning of a fresh adventure of Gawain in which he is said to hasten to the rescue of a knight and a damsel who are hotly pursued by three other knights. Two questions now naturally suggest themselves, viz. firstly, What was told in the continuation of the romance following *Fragment II.*? and, secondly, Do *Fragments I. and II.* contain any statements or allusions helpful in answering the first question? I am able to point to a number of such references. There are six from *Fragment I.*

Firstly, in the same battle in which, as we have seen, Nascien distinguishes himself before all the other Companions of the Round Table, the host of Leodegan consists of ten divisions. 'La premiere bataille ou li dragons estoit conduisoit li rois Artus & li rois Bans & li rois Bohors & li .xliij. compaignon & li chevalier de la Table Roonde,' etc. Concerning the leader of the seventh division the MSS. say :

A	B	C
fol. 140f, ed. page 218	fol. 59d	fol. 112b, ed. page 321
La setisme bataille mena Yder de la Terre as Norois a qui la bele auenture auint en la court le roy Artu de .v. aniaus quil traist du doi de la main al cheualier mort qui demandoit vengeance que onques cheualier qui en la cort le roy Artu fust nel pot traire ne auoir si comme li contes vous deuisera cha en auant.	La setisme mena messire Yders de la Terre as Norrois a cui la <sup>2</sup> bele auenture auint a la cort au roi Artu de .v. enniaus qui[!] traist hors des doiz du cheualier mort qui demandoit ueniance que onques cheualier qui fust a la cort ne pot faire si com li contes le uos deuisera en auant.	The .vij <sup>th</sup> . bataile ledde Ydiers, of the londe of Norwey, to whom the feire aventure fell in the courte of kynge Arthur of the .v. ringes that he drough oute of the deed knyghtes honde that asked vengaunce, that never knyght that was in that court myght haue, as the tale shall yow declare hereafter.

All three MSS. are unanimous in stating that the story will later

<sup>1</sup> On fol. 282a (ed. page 273) occurs the passage : 'Ci endroit dit li contes que tant exploita messires Gauuain puis quil se fu partiz de Eliezer & il ot les .ix. cheualiers desconfiz & ocis les .iiij. qui lauoient assailli por ses armes & son cheual gaaaignier que il uint au recet ou la cuer Guinganbresill [manoit].' This adventure of Gawain is not told in the text, must therefore have been omitted either accidentally or intentionally, and this fact suggests the possibility that other adventures may have had the same fate, when the *rifacimento* was made.

<sup>2</sup> MS. 'ou.'

on tell the adventure of the five rings, but it is neither told in *Fragment I.* nor in *Fragment II.*; it is reasonable, therefore, to assume that it was told in the chapters that followed at the end of *Fragment II.*, which we no longer possess.

Secondly, in the battle which arises out of King Loth's attempt to seize Guenever, when Artus, accompanied by Ban, Bohort, the Companions of the Round Table, and a large suite, leads his newly wedded wife to his own country, Gawain and Kex are said to arrive with eighty knights of Logres at the critical moment. The romancer profits by this opportunity to pass some remarks on the character of Artus's seneschal, and winds up with the following passage :

A

fol. 170f, ed. page 316

Mais loiaus cheualiers estoit uers son signor & enuers la roine iusqua la mort. Ne onques en sa uie ne fist traison cune seule. & cele fu de Loholt le fils au roy Artu que il ochist par enuie en la Forest Perilleuse. & par Perceual le Galois en fu acuses a court ensi comme vns ermites li conta qui li auoit ueu ochire.

B

fol. 104d

Mais loiaus cheualier estoit uers son segneur. & uers la roine & toz iors le fu iusqua la mort. ne onques en sa uie ne fist traison que une sole. ce fu de Lohout le fil du roi Artus que il ocist par enuie en la grant Forest Perilleuse. *einsi com li contes le uos deuisera ca auant moult loing. quant la matire mi amerra.* Mais tant en dit ore li contes ici endroit que par Perceual le Galois en fu il acusez<sup>1</sup> a cort. issi com li hermites le reconta a la cort qui li auoit ueu ocirre.

C

fol. 168b, ed. page 475

But a trewe knyght was he euer agein his lorde, and agein the queene, euer in to the ende of his deth. Ne neuer in all his live dide he treson saf oon, and that was of Lohoot the sone of kynge Arthur that he slough for enuye in the Foreste Perilouse, and for that Percevale ly Galoys was accused with grete wronge for the deth of the same [Lo]hoot, like as an Ermyte hit tolde after that hadde seyn all the dede.

The purport of this passage is the same in A, B, and C, but the translator of C blunders at the end by stating that Perceval was accused of having killed Lohot, as a hermit had declared that he had seen the deed with his own eyes, instead of stating that Perceval accused Kex, etc. While in A and C every trace of a reference to a future account of this incident is effaced, B not only states that the story will later on speak of it, but adds 'moult loing,' a term which seems to indicate that the story 'which will tell later on' was of inordinate length.

Thirdly, after defeating the rebel kings with the help of his allies Ban and Bohort, Artus rests for a while. At this time he makes the

<sup>1</sup> MS. 'acuser.'

acquaintance of the beautiful Lisanor, the daughter of Count Sevain 'par le conseil de Merlin.' With regard to this incident the MSS. state :

A

fol. 112c, ed. page 124

Et si tost comme li rois Artus vit la pucele si li plot moult & fist tant par Merlin quil parla a lui seul a seul & quil iurent vne nuit ensamble. & illuee fu engendres Lohot qui puis fu boins chevaliers & j. des compagnons de la Table Roonde. Et quant . . .

B

fol. 17d

Et si tost com li rois la uit si li plot molt & il li. si fist tant li rois par Merlin quil parla a lui seul a seul. & iurent ensemble une nuit & plusors tant com au roi sist. si fu le premier soir quil iut a lui engendez Lohoz qui puis fu uns des bons cheualiers quil couenist a querre en nule terre. & fu puis des compagnons de la Table Reonde. ieist fist puis maintes proesces es auentures qui lorc tens durerent. *si com li contes le uos dira ca auant.* mais quant . . .

C

fol. 58a, ed. page 171

. . . . .  
And so be the helpe of Merlin he spake with her previly, and lay with her a nyght, and that nyght vpon her was begeten Hoot, that after was a full noble knyght, and was also a felowe of the Rounde Table. This Hoot was of right high prowesse, *as ye shull heren hereafter* . . .

This passage clearly indicates that the adventures of Lohot must have been told somewhere in the continuation of *Fragment II*.

Fourthly, at the point where Artus's indiscretion with his own sister, the wife of King Loth, and the conception of Mordret are told, occurs in the MSS. the following passage :

A

fol. 113e, ed. page 129

si auint que li baron oreint prins iournee de uenir a court & de parler ensamble a la crois noire. si auint le soir deuant . . .

B

fol. 20b

si auint un ior que li baron oreint pris ior de parler ensemble a la crois noire. & ce porquoie ele fu apelee la eroiz noire *ce uos deuisera bien li contes ca en auant es cheualeries des cheualiers de la Table Reonde. car li leus nen est ore mie.* A cele croiz que ie uos di mistrent ior li baron dassembler un mein bien mein, si auint le soir deuant . . .

C

fol. 61b, ed. page 180

Hit fill that the barouns hadde take a counseile for to speke togeder at the blak crosse. And whi it was cleped the blake crosse *ye shall here herafter, and the names of the Knyghtes of the Rounde Table, but yet the tyme is not come to speke therof more.* At this crosse the barouns toke a day for to assemble erly on a morowe; and so it fill that on the nyght before . . .

In A this passage is curtailed. B and C agree in referring the reader to a later explanation of the reason why this cross was called

black. In *Lestoire del Saint Graal* (vol. i. of my edition, pages 244-246), when the treachery of Agrestes, a former king of Camaaloth, is spoken of, a cross is mentioned which turned black from the blood of the martyrs spilled upon it. The same account, slightly shortened, is reproduced in Part II. of the *Lancelot* (vol. iv. pages 321-322).

Fifthly, when the rebellious barons, after their defeat, had held a council of war at Sorhaut, they left that city one after another to return to their countries and defend them against the Saxons. The second to leave Sorhaut is the King of Norgales, concerning whom the MSS. state :

## A

fol. 114c, ed. page 131 note 4

& apres lui sen parti de  
la cite de Sorhaut li rois  
Tradelmans . . .

si se desfendi des Sesnes  
au miex que il pot qui  
moult li greuerent par  
deners le chastel que Caruile  
la cuer Hardogobran tenoit  
en sa baillie ne celui trespas  
ne porrent li trois roy tolir  
aus Sesnes pour pooir que  
il enssent ancois lor venoit  
viande et secours par ce  
chastel qui tant estoit fort  
que riens mesfaire ni pooit  
et par l enchantement dont  
Caruile sauoit tant conques  
nule femme nensot tant fors  
que Morgain la cuer le roy  
Artus. et Viviane que  
Merlins ama tant quil li  
aprist toutes les merueiles  
dou monde que li contes  
uous deuisera ca auant  
quant ma matere mi aportera  
et par ce chastel dont uous  
oez parler orrent li Sesne  
tont le recouurier et tout  
le secours dou pays. pour  
quoi il ne pouoient estre  
iecte de la terre tant que li  
roys Artus les en ietu et li

## B

fol. 21c

Apres se parti de Sorhan la  
cite li rois Tradelinanz de  
Norgales . . . Car li  
trespas estoit ilec a la  
Roche as Saines dont il  
estoient molt greue . . . si  
se desfendi des Saisnes au  
mielz quil pot. qui molt le  
greuerent par le chastel que  
Kanille la cuer Argadabrant  
tenoit en sa baillie.  
ne ce trespas ne poient  
onques li roi tolir as Saines  
por pooir que il eussent.  
encois lor uenoit uiaude &  
secors par cel chastel qui  
tant estoit forz que nus  
forfaire ni pooit. & si ni  
auoit forteresce nule de  
pierre ne de quarrel fors  
que de lair dont il estoit  
si fermez que nule rien  
forfaire ni pooit & par  
enchantment dont Kanille  
sauoit tant quainz nule  
dame tant nen sot fors que  
Morguein la cuer du roi  
Artus & fille Yquerne que  
Merlin ama tant. a cui il  
aprist a eles deus toute la  
merueille du mont que li  
contes uos deuisera ca auant  
quant ma matire mi amarra.  
& par cel chastel dont uos  
moez parler oreint li Saisne

## C

fol. 63a, b, ed. page 185

After that departed the  
kyng Tradlyuans of  
Northwales fro the cite of  
Sorhant . . . for the  
passages wer ther to go to  
the Roche as Saisnes where-  
of they were sore anoyed  
and greved. . . . And so  
he hym defended the beste  
wyse that he myght, and  
muche he hem greved to-  
ward the Castell that Carnyle,  
the suster of Hardogobran  
kepte in her baillie.  
Ne that passage ne myght  
not these thre kynges kepe  
for no power that thei  
hadden; but after that  
ther com soccour be that  
wey to the Saisnes of  
vitaile and of men be that  
castell that was stronge,  
and by the enchantment  
of Carnile that moste cowde  
of that art, but yef it were  
Morgain, the suster of kynge  
Arthur, and Nimiane that  
Merlin dide love so moche,  
that he taught here alle  
the merueiles of the worlde  
*as this boke shall declare yow  
hereafter.* And by that  
Castell wheréof I speke  
hadde the Saisnes all her  
recouerer and all her socour

A

roys Bans et li roys Boors  
de Gaunes si comme li contes  
uous deuisera ca auant et li  
enfant au roy Lot qui mer-  
ueilles y firent darmes.

B

tout lor recouurement de  
uiandes & toz le secors de  
lor [pa]is par coi il ne poient  
estre gite hors de la terre  
tant que li rois Artus & li  
rois Bans les en gitera. &  
li rois Bohorz de Gaunes si  
com li contes le uos deuisera  
ca auant. & li enfant au roy  
Loth qui a merueilles i firent  
darmes.

C

of the contrey, wher-  
thburgh thei myght neuer  
be put oute of the londe  
till that kynge Arthur drof  
hem oute, and the kynge  
Ban and the kynge Boors  
of Gannes, and the sones of  
kynge Loot as ye shull here  
telle hereafter, and of theire  
merueilouse prowesse of  
dedes of armes.

In A this passage is reduced to two sentences. I have supplied what is missing from the MSS. Nos. 105 and 9123 of the Bibliothèque Nationale ; but even thus supplemented the first column does not contain all that is to be found in the second and third ones. B and C, excepting some blunders of the translator, agree, but B is a little fuller than C. The scribe of B, however, blundered in writing ‘& fille Yguerne’ for Viviane, or Suniane as he writes in another place ; later on he writes nevertheless ‘aprist eles deus,’ thus clearly indicating that there must have been mentioned another woman whom Merlin loved so much.

All three passages as they stand state that the story will later on tell first, how Merlin will teach Morgan and Viviane many of his crafts ; second, and this is much more important, how Artus, with the help of Ban, Bohort, and the sons of King Loth, will drive the Saxons out of their stronghold. As the last-named adventure is not told anywhere in the MS. No. 337, it can only have been told in the continuation of *Fragment II.* we no longer possess. The conquest of the enchanted castle of the Saxons, ending with the deaths of Cavile and Hargodabran, in which Lancelot plays a very conspicuous part, forms the subject of the concluding chapters of Part I. of *Le Livre de Lancelot* (my edition, vol. iii. pages 407-427). To this account the MSS. cannot refer, because they mention Ban and Bohort and do not mention Lancelot, and rightly so, for Lancelot was a small boy when his father and his uncle died. The reference must therefore apply to another account in the continuation of *Fragment II.*, and this, in all probability, is the one which formed the basis of the narrative in *Le Livre de Lancelot*.

Sixthly, in the account of the strange adventures of King Bohort and his brother Guinebant in *La Forest Perilleuse Sans Retor*, the MSS. have the following passage :

A

fol. 149d, ed. page 246

Ensi com vous aues oi  
establi Guinebaus la karole  
& leschekier & puis i fist  
maint ieu & aprist la dame  
dont ele ouura puis maintes  
fois apres ce quil fu mors.  
Car il *fist puis torner le*  
*chastel & les karoles que*  
*Meraugis troua puis a la*  
*Cite Sans Non.* ou nuls  
cheualier errans ne finast  
iamais de quaroler tant que  
vn autre cheualier y uenist.

B

fol. 71d and 72a

Einsi com uos auez oi  
establi Guinebaut la que-  
role. & le geu de lesche-  
quier. & puis fist il maiuz  
biaus geus. & li aprist dom  
elle oura puis mainte fice  
puis quil fu morz. & puis li  
*fist il le Chastel Tornoiant*  
& les queroles dedenz que  
*Meraugis troua puis quant il*  
*queroit monseignor Gauuein*  
& qui troua puis la Cite  
Sans Non dont nus che-  
ualiers erranz ne finast  
iamais de queroler tant  
euns autres i uenoit.

C

fol. 128b, ed. page 363

Thus as ye have herde has  
Guynebaus stablished the  
carole and the Chekere, and  
after made he many a feire  
pley, and taught the may-  
den wherwith she wrought  
many tymes, after that he  
was deed; and after made  
he the Castell Tornoyier, and  
the karoles that Meranges  
fonde after at the Citee of  
Nameless, whereas noon  
arraunt knyght sholde not  
cesse to karole, till that  
a certein knyght com  
thider.

A misunderstands the name of the castle which Guinebant made, B calls it le Chastel Tornoiant, C the Castell Tornoyier. All three MSS. state that Meraugis found 'le chastel & les karoles,' but while A and C simply say, at the Cite Sans Non, B states, when in quest of Gawain who then found the Cite Sans Non. It is clear therefore that Gawain must have gone to the Cite Sans Non, and a quest of him, in which Meraugis was successful, must have been undertaken, and these adventures must have been told in the continuation of *Fragment II.* we no longer possess. Meraugis is only now and then mentioned in the Vulgate-Cycle in the lists of knights which form such a peculiar feature of the Arthurian prose-romances, but he is never said to perform any special deed. It would be interesting to find out if the Meraugis mentioned here is identical with the Meraugis, a natural son of King Mark, who plays a conspicuous part in the trilogy (Demanda) of the pseudo-Robert de Borron.

What emphasises the importance of the terms 'Chastel Tornoiant' and 'Cite Sans Non' is the fact that both are mentioned in *Fragment II.*, and the latter in connection with Gawain's name. On fol. 250b (page 246 of my edition), when, on their return from helping Agloval and his mother la Vueue Dame de le Gaste Forest Soutaine, Nacsien and his companions have seen the Holy Grail, and the latter, when Nascien has enlightened them, start in pursuit of it, they come on the fourth day to 'un quarrefor de .vij. voies.' One of the seven roads is said to lead to the Chastel Tornoiant. On fol. 281a (page 272) La Dame de Limos, formerly named Helaes, la bele pucele la cuer

Clapor le Riche la niece Meleager le Rous tells Eliezer, Gawain's squire, that his master 'sen uoist uers la Cite Sans Non,' while, according to the text, he is on his way to l'Ile Tornoiant to join Artus, Neutres, Urien, and Ydier. It is of course impossible to explain these discrepancies, but they corroborate the announcement that Gawain was, in the continuation of *Fragment II.*, in some way connected with the Cite Sans Non.

I can also point to two passages in *Fragment II.* indicating events to be told in its continuation. I feel sûre I should be able to point to many more if the MS., which had not yet been influenced by the *Lancelot* and formed the basis of the *rifacimento*, were available.

Firstly, on fol. 186 (my ed. page 132) a brilliant court is spoken of which Artus holds. The various personages who attend it are enumerated: 'mes Gosangos ni uint mie car il estoit dolenz de ses amis que messires Gauuain auoit bleciez & . . . si en fu la roine molt dolente en son cuer . . . & d'autre part est molt dolente de son pere . . . que malades gisoit . . . & nequedent si ne fu elle mie tant dolente de son pere quant il ni uint come de Gosangos a cui ele auoit samor promise & lama molt uolentiers sil i uolsist entendre. & neporquant si en fist ele tant tel ior fu que lamor fust enterine se ne fust messires Gauuain qui les troua ensemble qui les departi apres ce que Gosangos fu deuenuz des compaignons de la Table Roonde. & en fu granz la meslee entreus deus quant les apaierent li compaignon de la Table Roonde. mais or se taist atant li contes . . .'

The incident alluded to in this passage is not told in *Fragment II.*; it must therefore form the subject of some chapter in its continuation we do no longer possess. The passage, as well as some earlier ones, suggests that that Gosangos was Guenever's lover before and after she married Artus.

Secondly, on his way to the Chastel d'Orofoise, to free the countess of that name from the attentions of a giant that were repugnant to her, Artus has an adventure with a lioness. He saves her cub from being strangled by two serpents. Both animals are said to be very grateful, and, one day, richly repay the king for this kind action, 'einsi com li contes le uos deuiseera ca auant quant leus sera quar li leus ni est ore mie que len le doie retraire' (fol. 234c, ed. p. 218). We do not learn anywhere under what circumstances the lioness and her cub demonstrated their gratitude to Artus, and may therefore, rightly, assume that an account of this second meeting between the king and the two animals formed part of the

chapters which one day followed those forming the end of *Fragment II.*

It is clear from the evidence I have adduced that the lost continuation of *Fragment II.* must have contained at the very least accounts of the following: First, adventures of Lohot that led to his becoming a companion of the Round Table. Second, the reasons why the point, where King Loth met his allies, while Artus begat Mordret, was called la Croiz Noire. Third, the Conquest of La Roche as Saisnes by Artus with the help of the brother-kings Ban and Bohort. Fourth, the adventure of the five rings which Yder de la Terre as Norois drew from the dead knight's finger. Fifth, a quest of Gawain by Meraugis, in the course of which he came to the Chastel Tornoiant, and Gawain's connection with la Cite Sans Non. Sixth, the circumstances which led to Lohot's death by the hand of Kex in the Forest Perilleuse. Seventh, the completion of Gawain's adventure beginning on fol. 294, col. d of the MS. No. 337. Eighth, the doings of Guenever and Gosangos. Ninth, an adventure of Artus, in which, being in danger of losing his life, he was saved by the lioness or her cub or by both. All the rest, and that apparently not a little, we are left to conjecture, unless, a not very likely eventuality, a MS. is unearthed somewhere, to demonstrate the reality.

IV. *The romance indicated in sections I., II., and III., and the Joseph-Lancelot-Perceval-Cycle.* Three passages, one from *Fragment I.* with its equivalents in the MSS. A and C, two from *Fragment II.*, which accidentally and opportunely escaped the attention of the *assembleurs*, and survived in the MSS. to this day because they had become meaningless to later scribes, demonstrate that the romance I have so far reconstructed figured already as a link between Robert de Borron's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* when the passage:<sup>1</sup> & le grant conte de Lancelot couuient repairier en la fin a Perceual qui est chies en la fin de toz les contes as autres cheualiers & tuit sont branches de lui por ce quilacheua la grant queste. Et li contes de Perceual meismes est une branche del haut conte del graal qui est chiez de tout les contes. Car por le graal se traueillent tuit li bon cheualier dont lan parole de celui tans,' had still a *raison d'être* in the latter, in other words in the

<sup>1</sup> In the MS. No. 751 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 144, col. c, and in the MS. Lansdowne 757, fol. 164, col. a, in the British Museum.

*Joseph-Lancelot-Perceval-Cycle*, of which, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the MS. No. 748 is the only known relic.<sup>1</sup> But to return to the three passages :

Firstly, when the rebel kings after their defeat by Artus, Ban, and Bohort, and last, not least, through Merlin's strategy, reach Sorhaut, they learn that the Saxons have invaded their territories. They hold a council 'en la grant sale au roy Urien.' King Bran-goires, who addresses them first, explains the reasons why they can hope for no assistance from Kings Leodegan, Pelles, Pellinor, and Alain. The passage referring to the three last-named brothers runs in the MSS. thus :

A

fol. 112d, ed. page 125

Ne par decha du roy Pelles<sup>2</sup> de Listenois natendons nous nul secors. car il garde le roy Pel[le]jinor son frere qui gist malades dun mal dont iamais naura garison tant que cil vendra laiens qui les auentures du Saint Graal metera a fin. ne del roy Alain qui gist malades natendons nous nul secors deuant ee que li mieudres cheualiers del *monde* uiegne a lui & li demant dont cele maladie li vint & quel chose li Graaus est [&] que len sert...

B

fol. 18b

Ne par deca du roi Pelles de Listenois natendons nos nul secors car il garde le roi Pellinor son frere qui gist malades dun mahaig quil a dont il naura iamais garison tant que cil uendra laienz qui les auentures du Saint Graal doit mener a fin. ne du roi Alein lor frere qui gist malades qui ne garra tant que li mieldres cheualiers des *Bretons* li aura demande porcoi il ot<sup>3</sup> ceste maladie & quex chose li Graals est & cui en se[r]t.

C

fol. 58b, ed. page 173

Ne the kynge Pelles of Lytenoys, for he kepeth the kynge Pellynor his brother that lyeth seke, of which se[k]nesse he shall neuer be heled till he come that shall bryng to ende the auentures of the Seint Graal. Ne of the kynge Alain, his brother, that lith in sekenesse, and shall neuer be warisshed till the beste knyght of alle *Bretouns* come and aske hym why he hath that maladye, and what thinge sholde be hys helpe . . .

This passage, as will be seen by a comparison of the three columns, is nearly identically worded in the three MSS.—in fact in many others also—of very different pedigree, except that the translator of C has rendered the second question 'and how he can be cured of this malady.' This agreement is a proof that the passage has not been tampered with and preserved its original form. But

<sup>1</sup> The *Joseph* from this MS. about which I have spoken a good deal on former occasions, and which I consider from a critical point of view important, is printed by E. Hucher in his *Le Saint Graal*, etc., 3 vols., Le Mans, 1874-1878, 8vo. I have had the *Merlin* from this MS. photographed some years ago, and prepared an edition of it. If I am spared I may some day publish it, together with Part I. of the MS. No. 337, of which I also possess a transcript ready for Press by my own hand.

<sup>2</sup> MS., 'Peiles.'

<sup>3</sup> MS., 'lot.'

there is one point which, insignificant as it may appear, makes all the difference : 'des Bretons' in B and C is replaced by 'du monde' in A. Now Galahad was never styled by the French romancers, to whom he owed his very existence, 'le meilleur chevalier des Bretons'; he was 'le meilleur chevalier du monde.' Perceval was the best knight of the Britons, and it was part of his task in the quest of the Grail to go to the maimed fisher-king and ask him the two questions given above, while no such condition was imposed on Galahad the son of Lancelot.

Secondly, another passage occurs on fol. 194a (p. 147 of my edition of the MS. No. 337), and is, in slightly modified terms, but a repetition of the first-named. It runs thus :

'Ge ne die mie que autre cheualier preu & uaillant ne uoient assez de ses miracles mais li pechie mortel ou il gerront & gisent lor toudra si la clarte des elz & du cuer que quant il le uerront nu conoistront ne riens nen demanderont. ne li rois Alains ne li rois Pellinor (written : Pelletor), ne li rois Pellinor ne garront de lor plaies tant que li chevaliers gise en lor ostel & ait demande cui len sert du Saint Graal & ia si tost ne laura demande que cil ne soit gariz chies cui il le demandera.'

Thirdly, the following passage occurs on fol. 183a (ed. p. 127), and runs thus :

'Car le cors meismes Merlin qui dels estoit estrait uostrent il torner a destruction par une fame a cui il se deduisoit & si nen auoit sanz plus que le pense. & por ce que nostre sires na cure de delit de cors laissa il son cors martire soufrir & endurer por ce que il li auoit mostree la droite uoie. mais ne uost mie perdre lesperit quil auoit en lui mis por les granz biens que il auoit fait a son pueple tant com il fu en son demaine pooir. si envoia un *suen seriant chaste & leial & chier en terre a lui desprisoner qui fu de la lignie Dauid le bon roi comme li contes le uos devisera ca avant se dex done tant a maistre Gautier Mape qui[!] le puisse translater du latin ou il le trueue en romanz par la proiere au bon roi Henri qui tant len a proie.'*

If one compares the words printed in italics with the passage found in the *Lancelot* MS. 754, fol. 14 col. b, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, 'tant que Perleuax lan traist et gita hors qui vit la grant merueille del graal apres la mort de Lohot [MS., *Lancelot*] <sup>1</sup> si

<sup>1</sup> Lohot for Lancelot is E. Brugger's suggestion. Conf. page 41, note 1.

com li contes vos deuisera ca auant,' one cannot be in doubt as to who the 'seriant chaste et leial' is.

In order to realise how careless the scribes were and how little they knew of the romances, it is well to compare these two passages with the one I quoted on p. 31, and with the remarks found on fol. 249 cols. a and b (ed. p. 243) by the same man who wrote the passage quoted from fol. 183a :

' & son petit fill Perceval<sup>1</sup> qui na encore que an & demi,' and

' par ce que tu as mescreu mes miracles que ge demostroie par cest pais por ce sera tes filz Perceual reusez davoir le Graal en sa garde jusque apres la mort au fill de la fille le roi Pelles car se tes pechiez ne fust de ce que mescreu as tes filz leust auant en garde.'

*V. Conclusions to be drawn from the facts established in sections I. to IV. The beginning and the end of the romance I call *Le Livre d'Artus*.* By the evidence I have adduced so far, I think I may reasonably claim to have satisfied the most captious critic that I am not theorising but dealing with facts, and to have convincingly demonstrated that there existed at one time a huge compilation<sup>2</sup> (with the additions and omissions I have described), of considerably more than twice the size of the link between Robert de Borron's *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* in the Vulgate-Cycle, and that a not inconsiderable part of this compilation figured already in the cycle from which the Vulgate-Cycle sprang. This romance or compilation, which I claim to have reconstructed and recalled from oblivion, is *Le Livre d'Artus*, forming the subject of the present monograph.

While I have so far been able to base my demonstration solely on concrete facts, I shall have henceforth to resort also to hypothesis.

When I consider my *Livre d'Artus* in its entirety, I come to the conviction that, such as I have reconstructed it so far, it is like a body without a head and without feet. I clearly recognise that it cannot possibly have begun with the events told on the first leaves of the MS. No. 337, and not one of the adventures I have enumerated in section III. can have formed its end. I am therefore logically and naturally driven to the conclusion that in its original form *Le Livre d'Artus* began with the reign of Uterpandragon or even earlier, related Artus's birth and life to his accession, and ended

<sup>1</sup> Conf. my notes in vol. vii. pp. 146 and 147 concerning the ages of Perceval in the *Perceval*-Quest and in the Vulgate-Cycle.

<sup>2</sup> Conf. *supra*, p. 33.

with his death. In other words, its opening chapters dealt with the same events as Robert de Borron's *Merlin*, while a *Mort Artus*, such *e.g.* as is found in the so-called *Didot-Perceval*, filled its concluding ones. Robert de Borron's *Merlin*, which the *assembleurs* have prefixed to the *Vulgate-Merlin*, or more correctly to which the *assembleurs* have appended the *Vulgate-Merlin*, cannot be considered to form a proper early history of what is told in the opening chapters of *Le Livre d'Artus*, so much is shown beyond a doubt by a series of contradictions and discrepancies which already Paulin Paris recognised, without, however, being able to explain their cause. I will not recapitulate these anomalies here, for they are well known, but I will show by two quotations that in the early history which *Le Livre d'Artus* postulates, the brother kings Ban and Bohort, whom Robert de Borron does not mention at all, must have already been the vassals and allies of Artus's father, King Uterpandragon :

Firstly, when Merlin has advised Artus to invite Ban and Bohort to come to him, Artus commissions Bretel and Ulfin to carry his invitation to la Petite Bretaigne. The following passage explains why these two knights are chosen :

A

fol. 104c, ed. page 98

Et cil (Bretel and Ulfin) qui moult estoient bien des ij. rois (Ban and Bohort) qui laloient querre car moult estoient entrame au tans le roy Vterpandragon passerent la mer . . .

B

fol. 4c

Et cil qui molt estoient bien des deus rois & maintes foiz auoient eu afaire ensemble & molt estoient entrame de long tens si passerent oltre la mer . . .

C

fol. 41a, ed. page 124

For these two knyghtes were well aqneynyt with these two kynges that thei wente to scche, for moche thei togeder loveden, and well were aqeynted in the tyme of Vterpendragon. And they passed oner the see . . .

Secondly, in a long but fruitless war which Uterpandragon is said to have waged upon King Amant, because the latter refused to recognise his suzerainty, he conquered the fine Castle de la Charroie. To this incident refers the following passage :

A

fol. 147c, ed. page 238

Mes toutes uoies les greuant li rois Vterpandragon quil conquist sor lui .j. moult riche castel qui estoit apeles Charroie. . . . Icel

B

fol. 68c

Mais toutes uoies le greua il tant quil conquist sor lui un molt riche chastel qui auoit non Charroe. . . . Ice chastel dona au roi Bohorz

C

fol. 123b, ed. page 350

But Vterpandragon greved hym sore with his werre and conquered vpon hym a Castell that was stronge and riche, and was clepede

A

chastel douna li roi Vterpandragon au roy Bohort de Gaunes a lui & a ses hoirs & toute la seignorie . . . & si tost comme li rois Bohors lot en sa baillie si le douna a Guinebant son frere a garder qui moult estoit boins cler & sages & as armes preus & hardis & ses maistres estoit. si en fu moult dolans li rois Amans.

B

de Gaunes li rois Utars a son uiuant a lui & a ses hoirs & tote la segnorie car molt li auait ualu & aidie tant com il fu uis a guerroier ses anemis. & si tost come li rois lot eu en sa baillie si le bailla a Guinebaut son frere a garder qui molt estoit bons cler & sages & preuz as armes se mestier fust & hardiz si en fu molt dolenz li rois Amanz.

C

Carroie. . . . This Castell yaf Vterpendragon to the kynge Boors of Gannes in his lyve to hym and to his heires all the lordship, and as soone as the kynge Bohors hadde it in his baillie he yaf it to Guynebant, his brother, that was a goode clerke and a wise, and at armes wight and hardy yef nede were, and therfore was the kynge Amaunt angry.

I do not think there can be any doubt that *Le Livre d'Artus*, as it appears in the MS. No. 337, was preceded by another early history than Robert de Borron's *Merlin*, one which we no longer possess, some fragments of which may have accidentally survived. I think it is both possible and probable that the account of Merlin's birth intercalated in the *Lancelot* MS. No. 754 at the Bibliothèque Nationale is based on this early history, and the same may be said of a passage in the MS. No. 748 describing the last war of Uterpandragon before he died.

And, granted that another early history preceded the events told at the beginning of *Le Livre d'Artus*, it is not unreasonable to assume that a *Mort Artus* ended it. This *Mort Artus* may be the one which formed the source of Huchown's metrical version, or it may have been independently derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum*.

The knowledge that such a huge *Livre d'Artus* ever existed, completely at variance as it is with what has hitherto been accepted by scholars as probable or correct, constitutes a greater progress in the critical exploration of the Arthurian romances than has been achieved in the last fifty years, and will necessitate the re-writing of a chapter of French mediæval literature. The existence of such a *Livre d'Artus* is compatible with the views—and indeed confirms their soundness—which I have briefly expressed on the genesis of the Vulgate-Cycle in my Introduction to *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, and which, owing probably to their conciseness and heterodox character, do not seem to have attracted the attention they deserve. *Le Livre d'Artus* enables me to set forth more precisely and to substantiate, so

far as this is possible, my theory on the genesis of *Le Livre de Lancelot*.

VI. *Le Livre d'Artus* was the stock on which *Le Livre de Lancelot* was grafted, a considerable portion of which it has gradually absorbed. Although the relationship between the *Lancelot* and *Le Livre d'Artus* must obviously be quite another than that existing between the *Lancelot* and *Fragments I. and II.*, it is necessary to know the latter in order to determine the former. The opinion which Gaston Paris expressed in 1878 in his Introduction to the *Huth-Merlin*, 'Quand on examine ce roman [the *Vulgate-Merlin*] avec attention on voit qu'il a été composé après le *Roman de Lancelot* pour le préparer, et pour servir de transition entre le *Merlin* de Robert de Borron et le *Lancelot* . . . C'est cette lacune que s'est proposé de combler l'auteur du *Livre d'Artus*; il l'a fait, soit en développant des indications du *Lancelot*, soit en reprenant dans *Gaufrei de Monmouth* ou dans le *Perceval* de Robert, soit en compilant des récits de provenance diverse,' and which held the field ever since it appeared in print till I challenged it in 1908 in my Introduction, is now proved to be untenable. Already in 1908 I had recognised that the *Lancelot* was posterior in date to *Fragment II.* plus the last third of the *Vulgate-Merlin* not found in the MS. No. 337, and that therefore the latter cannot be a development of indications found in the former. I do not think I can do better than to recapitulate the main points of my argumentation. A comparison of the *Vulgate-Merlin* with the *Lancelot* reveals that, in spite of many artificially created agreements and interpolated references, there is no unity of time in the two romances; for in the former, Ban and Bohort, the two brother-kings and allies of Artus, are in the prime of manhood; vigorous and brave, they take an active part in Artus's battles and perform personally prodigies of valour and endurance. They are for the last time mentioned as joining Artus's host in the war against the Romans (told toward the end of the *Vulgate-Merlin*), which takes place at least several years after Artus's marriage. In the opening chapter of the latter, Ban and Bohort are described as old and decrepit men; their sons, Lancelot, Bohort, and Lionel, were born to them in their old age. There is no mention of their helping Artus in his wars: they are said to have been the vassals of Uterpandragon, and only paid Artus a brief visit to do him homage as their new liege lord on the occasion of his coronation, which

appears to have taken place almost simultaneously with his marriage. There has been no secrecy about Artus's birth, and he is said to have succeeded his father when hardly more than a boy. As the visit of Cladas in disguise to Great Britain, told in the seventh *laisse*, is expressly stated to take place very shortly after Artus's accession, and only five or seven months after his marriage with Guenever, and as this visit is timed after the death of Ban and Bohort, the one related in the third, the other reported in the fourth *laisse*, the two brother-kings cannot have long survived their return from Great Britain. 'In the *Vulgate-Merlin* the marriage of Artus and Guenever takes place at Carohaise in Carmelide, at the court of King Leodegan, Archbishop Dubrice officiating, the same who in Robert's *Merlin* anoints and crowns Artus. In the *Lancelot* the wedding is celebrated at St. Stephen's, London, by the archbishop Eugen.'

'The account of what takes place on the night of the wedding at Carohaise in the *Vulgate-Merlin* flatly contradicts what, according to the *Lancelot*, takes place on the day following the ceremony in London. The attempted abduction of Artus's wedded wife and the substitution for her of Leodegan's natural daughter, prevented only by Merlin's knowledge and forethought, and the subsequent identification by Leodegan of his legitimate daughter Guenever, by means of "lensegne de la corone sour les rains," causes the account in the *Lancelot* to appear ridiculous and improbable. It is difficult to imagine that the attempt to ravish his bride on the night of the wedding was kept secret from Artus; it is still more unlikely that Artus, her husband, should, after having been married some time, have ignored the means by which their father was able to distinguish the true from the false Guenever, nor that such an important birth-mark should have disappeared, after it had existed from the moment of her birth to the wedding-day of the legitimate Guenever. The *Vulgate-Merlin* cannot possibly have been specially written for its purpose, so much is clear. Such anomalies as do exist between this romance and the *Lancelot* can be explained only by the assumption that the *Vulgate-Merlin* represents the clumsy and careless adaptation of some earlier work; otherwise its writer would have studiously avoided to mention circumstances which render what followed improbable and absurd. There is not the least allusion to the birth-mark in the *Lancelot*, though in an apparently later interpolation the incident at Carohaise is mentioned in contradiction to the former

statement that the wedding and the alleged abduction of the true Guenever took place in London. . . . Many more points may be urged against the hypothesis that the *Vulgate-Merlin* is a development of indications in the *Lancelot*. One of the most conclusive and convincing is the fact that a number of incidents are told at much greater detail in the *Vulgate-Merlin* than in the *Lancelot*, its alleged source. The conception of Hector des Mares, the natural brother of Lancelot, is a case in point; the account of Leodegan, the father of Guenever, is another. It is difficult to comprehend that the mere mention of Leodegan in the letter which the false Guenever sends to Artus and the little said about him in the sixty-fifth *laisse* can be indications from which all that is said about that king in the *Vulgate-Merlin* is developed. Granted even that the writer of the *Vulgate-Merlin* had adopted the irrational and uncommon course of starting to build his house from the roof downwards, *i.e.* to write an early history of the persons and incidents in the *Lancelot* by taking as his starting-point what is said about them in this romance, it would still be incomprehensible why he should have done so at variance rather than in harmony with his source.'

And what I have said of the *Vulgate-Merlin*, *i.e.* about *Fragment I.* plus the section which is not found in the MS. No. 337, applies in a still higher degree to *Fragment II.*, which was also adjusted to the *Vulgate-Cycle*, but apparently at a considerably later date. *Fragment II.* contains a larger number of episodes which form as it were the preliminary or early history of corresponding episodes in the *Lancelot*. I am referring to what is said about La Dolereuse Garde, the conquest of which forms so prominent a feature in Part II. of the *Lancelot*; about the achievements and actions of Galebot le fils a la bele Iaiande; about the misfortune of Alier; about Groadain the dwarf and his niece, and Gawain, who in the *Lancelot* fights against Segurades who molests the lady of Roestoc with his attentions. I am thinking of Karacados and his brothers, one of whom was killed by Gawain, another by Driant le Gai, the brother of Meliant le Gai, both sons of Trabant le Gai; about Karacados' mother and Meliant's sweetheart and the establishment of the Dolorous Tower; about Guiomar and Morgan, and the establishment of the Val Sans Retour ou des Faux Amants; about Escalon le Tenebreux; about what is told concerning la Chauciee Norgaloise; about the construction of the Pont d'Espree and the Pont Perdu ou Sous liaue, etc., etc. It would far transgress the limits of the present mono-

graph were I to attempt here a detailed comparison of these episodes as they are found in the two romances: I will only state that such a study discloses a similar variation in their data as that shown to exist in the account of the events on Artus's wedding-day I have discussed above.

If, therefore, the *Lancelot* does not, and cannot, form the basis of or be the source of *Fragment I. plus* its continuation in the Vulgate-Cycle and of *Fragment II.*, both must have been written before this romance, or both and the *Lancelot* must have been derived from a common earlier source. And, as I have demonstrated that *Fragment I. and II.* represent considerable portions of *Le Livre d'Artus*, it follows—for what applies to the parts must also apply to the whole—*i.e.* that *Le Livre d'Artus* must be anterior to the *Lancelot* and be its basis or source, or both must have a common source. The extremely scanty material which has survived to our days renders it almost impossible to trace a common source if there ever was one, but I do not think there is any necessity for assuming the existence of one. If it were possible to compare *Le Livre d'Artus* in its original form with the *Lancelot*, as it is known to us in the Vulgate-Cycle, such a comparison would disclose, on the one hand, many discrepancies and not a few anomalies, on the other a great many more features common to both. Some of these common features are even now not completely obliterated. In section V. I have shown that *Le Livre d'Artus* presupposes an early history of Artus and his father Uterpandragon different from that given in Robert de Borron's *Merlin*, for the brother-kings Ban and Bohort are already the vassals and allies of Artus's father. With this postulate the *Lancelot* is in complete agreement. Uterpandragon, we are told in the *Lancelot*, crosses over to France to help King Aramons to defeat Claudas and to lay waste his land, which for this reason is called 'la terre deserte.' Uterpandragon is said to spare only the city of Bourges in remembrance of the days he passed there. Nascien, Hervi de Rivel, Ganor de Cahert, and several other knights are said to have already been Companions of the Round Table in the reign of Uterpandragon. In another place, Hervi de Rivel is said to be more than eighty years old. Ywain learns from an old hermit, formerly a knight, that he knew his father in the days of Uterpandragon. This hermit would have been a Companion of the Round Table had he not declined the honour, because he mortally hated one of its Companions. One of Lancelot's hosts

tells him that when Artus, a mere boy, was to be crowned after his father's death, all Uterpandragon's liege-men were summoned to receive their land from the young king and do him homage. Amongst those who obeyed this summons were Ban the king of Benoyc, and Bohort, the king of Gannes. At another place we are told, that fifteen days after the marriage of Artus and Guenever, Bohort and Ban, who was of 'grant eage,' start on a brief visit to Great Britain to do Artus homage. And, lastly, on another occasion, a knight is stated to have told Bohort, the son of King Bohort: 'Il auint au couronement le roy Artus que tout li homme de la terre vindrent pour lui fere honour et feste. Et en ce que li rois Bohors vostres peres sen revenoit a grant compaignie si lot agaitie li roys Cerses del Vermeil Castiel qui le haoit de mortel hayne por ce quil auoit ochis son fil.'

As I have pointed out on page 38, the circumstances connected with Artus's birth and accession when hardly more than a boy, and his marriage with Guenever the daughter of King Leodegan shortly after his coronation, are evidently, in the *Lancelot*, completely at variance with Robert de Borron's account of these events. Is it not more than probable that the writer of the *Lancelot* has derived his information from a similar account as that in *Le Livre d'Artus*?

The writer of the *Lancelot* does not yet know Merlin the Enchanter in the character Robert de Borron has given him, as is evident from the fifth *laisse* in Part I. The birth of Merlin, etc., was probably told in *Le Livre d'Artus* in harmony with the intercalation<sup>1</sup> to be found in the *Lancelot* MS. No. 754 at the Bibliothèque Nationale. It is quite within the bounds of possibility that this intercalation is directly or indirectly derived from *Le Livre d'Artus*. There is one more feature common to *Le Livre d'Artus* and the *Lancelot*, and this, I believe, provides the key which enables us to understand the relationship between the two compilations.

I have shown in section III. in the fifth quotation that, among many other incidents and adventures, there was told in *Le Livre d'Artus*, at one time, how Artus with his allies Ban and Bohort undertook an expedition against the Saxons which resulted in the conquest of their stronghold La Roche as Saisnes. An account of a similar expedition having the same result, in which Ban and

<sup>1</sup> Fols. 10c-13d. It is printed by E. Brugger in *Zeitschrift für franz. Sprache und Litteratur*, vol. xxxi. pp. 277-281.

Bohort are replaced by Lancelot and Galehot, forms, as I have stated at the same time, a feature of the *Lancelot* toward the end of Part I.

Considering all I have been able to say about the existence, the structure, and the component parts of *Le Livre d'Artus*; considering further the intimate connection and reciprocity which undoubtedly exists between this romance and the *Lancelot*; and lastly, carefully weighing all the points in which both agree and in which they are at variance, it is my deliberate opinion, nay my conviction, that all this, if it may point to more than one single conclusion, points only to one single conclusion satisfactory in all respects, viz., that the compilation with which the first and subsequent compilers of the *Lancelot* expect their readers to be familiar, without a knowledge of which much of what they tell would lack foundation, can be no other than *Le Livre d'Artus*. I believe, as I stated in my Introduction, that the *Lancelot* was grafted (I can think of no better term to express what I mean) on *Le Livre d'Artus*, by giving to the brother-kings, Ban and Bohort, children in their old age; by identifying the son of Ban with a knight Lancelot, known at the time in French literature (as may be concluded from the lost French source which Ulrich von Zatzikhoven declares he drew upon in his *Lanzelet*), by naming the sea-fairy by whom this knight Lancelot was brought up, Viviane, and fusing into one her personality and that of the maiden by whose wiles Merlin was ensnared.

I believe that *Le Livre d'Artus* was on three successive occasions <sup>1</sup> ransacked, as it were, by the compilers of the *Lancelot*, and that most of the episodes which now figure in *Fragments I. and II.* and in the *Lancelot*, were at one time completely told in *Le Livre d'Artus*, but transferred and adapted to their new surroundings, as was the case with the expedition against the Saxons and the conquest of La Roche as Saisnes. *Le Livre d'Artus*, at one time of proportions not falling short of those of the *Lancelot* in the Vulgate-Cycle, grew gradually smaller while the *Lancelot* increased in bulk, and it was

<sup>1</sup> Ibidem, I state: 'A study of the *Lancelot* MSS. enables us to recognise three successive phases in the development of this romance, which correspond to the dates. First, when the *Perceval*-Quest was embodied in the romance; second, when it became a component of the first cycle; and third, when this latter was transformed into the Vulgate-Cycle. While it is not difficult to distinguish the old stock of the romance from later additions and modifications, it is not always easy to determine whether the latter were made at the beginnings of the first or second phases of its development. The additions made, and changes effected when the Vulgate-Cycle was formed, do not, however, belong to this category.'

reduced to a mutilated *torso*, when the compiler of the Vulgate-Cycle deprived it of what I have styled *Fragment II. plus* an unknown quantity,<sup>1</sup> and replaced its end by what now forms the last third of the Vulgate-*Merlin*. And this rivalry between the two romances, a consequence of the acclimatisation of the *matière de Bretagne*<sup>2</sup> on French soil, is but a reflection of the struggle of the Celtic or British champion Gawain and the French champion Lancelot for the first place among the Companions of the Round Table and the knights of their age. It was not decided by the sword and the lance but by the pen of the *trouvères* in favour of their countryman. The relegation of the British champion to the second place soon afterwards compelled another British knight to cede his place of honour to a Frenchman, for Galahad was a Frenchman, although his mother was the daughter of King Pelles, the uncle of Perceval.

<sup>1</sup> The reason why the greater part of *Le Livre d'Artus* was suppressed and replaced by another shorter account was not, of course, as has been suggested, the salacious character of that romance, but simply and solely the tendency to reduce it and increase the *Lancelot*, and the fact that the same adventures could not very well appear both in the one and in the other.

<sup>2</sup> *Conf.* what I stated in my Introduction, p. vii. ‘The *matière de Bretagne*, though undoubtedly the fountain-head of many incidents, episodes, and adventures in Arthurian romance, has exercised an infinitesimal, if any *direct*, influence on the several branches of the Vulgate-Cycle. The Vulgate-Cycle, as handed down to our days in manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, is an entirely French production, which originated in the north of France towards the end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth. The *trouvères* and compilers, or *assemblieurs*, dealt with material that had already become completely acclimatised in France and was in but very few cases modified by recourse to oral tradition. In brief, the French prose-romances, forming together the Vulgate-Cycle, are the fruit into which the *matière de Bretagne* ripened on French soil, and by the administrations of specific French cultivation. The writer of the *Lancelot* in its original form, Chrestien de Troye, Robert de Borron, the writer of *Lestoire del Saint Graal* and *Vulgate-Quest*, and he who was responsible for the adaptation of the material forming *Le Livre d'Artus*, all were Frenchmen and all made use of French source-material. Merlin the fatherless child, as Robert de Borron represents him, and the grotesque, in some respects burlesque, personage into which he has degenerated in *Le Livre d'Artus*, is but an anamorphism of the Celtic enchanter.’

‘Syr Lancelot, the title-hero of the huge romance of that name, has no prototype in Celtic literature. The only incident in his life which is indirectly derived from the *matière de Bretagne* is his bringing up by a fairy. The *Lancelot* is out and out the conception and creation of a French brain, as also is its hero's association with King Arthur's Queen. Syr Lancelot is a Frenchman by birth and education, the ideal type of the French knight of the twelfth century, with all his most brilliant qualities and faults; he was deliberately designed to usurp—and has usurped—the place of the Celtic or British hero Syr Gawain, who had until then been unanimously acclaimed the best knight in the world, the foremost of the companions of Arthur's celebrated Round Table, etc.’

VII. *The part of Le Livre d'Artus in the evolution of the Vulgate-Cycle.* I will now attempt to briefly sketch the part which, in the light of the results of my labours, I believe *Le Livre d'Artus* to have played in the development of the Arthurian prose-romances or in the genesis of the Vulgate-Cycle, and a comparison with what I have said on that subject in my Introduction will show that, beyond adding another stage and enabling me in some respects to be more precise, the knowledge of the existence of *Le Livre d'Artus* does not entail any modification.

When the idea was conceived to carry out the plan in prose which Robert de Borron had intended to carry out in verse, as he stated at the end of his *Joseph*,<sup>1</sup> it was recognised that the single sentence 'Ensi fu Artus esleu a roy & tint la terre & le regne de Logres lonc tans en pais' was too inadequate an account of Artus's reign for a grail-cycle. To remedy this defect recourse was had to *Le Livre d'Artus*, which is often referred to in the MSS. as 'Li Contes des Estoires.' As the crude craftsmen, the *assembleurs* undoubtedly were, shrank from altering Robert de Borron's popular *Joseph* and *Merlin*, they rendered them into prose, and eliminated from *Le Livre d'Artus* what corresponded to the events told in the *Merlin*. They did not trouble to harmonise the heterogeneous material they joined, and it is therefore not surprising that some glaring discrepancies and contradictions were allowed to exist, some of which have survived in the MSS. to the present day—I am referring to those Paulin Paris<sup>2</sup> was the first to point out. The first grail-cycle consisted thus of—

First, the prose renderings of Robert's *Joseph* and *Merlin*.

Second, *Le Livre d'Artus minus* what corresponded to the *Merlin*.

Third, a *Perceval*-Quest probably inserted in *Le Livre d'Artus* before the description of Artus's campaign against the Romans.

Taking this cycle as his model, an unknown French writer conceived later the plan of completing Robert's work by adding to it what is known as the *Didot-Perceval*.<sup>3</sup>

About the same time another anonymous writer, also a Frenchman, who posed as Gautier Map, the archdeacon of Oxford, influenced

<sup>1</sup> Conf. E. Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, etc., vol. i. p. 332.

<sup>2</sup> Paulin Paris, *Romans*, etc., vol. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Conf. H. O. Sommer, *Messire Robert de Borron und der Verfasser des Didot-Perceval*. Beiheft No. 17 zur *Zeitschrift für roman. Philologie*, 1908.

by Chrestien's *Romans de la Charrete*<sup>1</sup> and by the source of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's *Lanzelet*, wrote the *Lancelot*, taking as his basis *Le Livre d'Artus*, not improbably with the deliberate intention of embodying his composition in the grail-cycle. This first draught of the *Lancelot* was evidently of very small dimensions, and not unlikely what forms now Part I.<sup>2</sup>

The next step in the evolution of the Arthurian prose-romances was the formation of the *Joseph-Lancelot-Perceval-Cycle*. The prose-renderings of Robert's *Joseph* and *Merlin* remained untouched; *Le Livre d'Artus* was slightly reduced, the account of the birth of Lancelot, Bohort, and Lionel was added to it, and the *Lancelot* was intercalated before the *Perceval-Quest*. The last branch, *La Mort Artu*, received already the form which it now has. It is not improbable that this cycle was subjected to, at least, one revision, and that some of the changes were introduced in the *Lancelot* and *Le Livre d'Artus*, which it is so difficult to date.

When Lancelot had gradually stepped into the place of Gawain, the time had arrived for replacing Perceval by Galahad. *Lestoire del Saint Graal* and the *Galahad* Quest were written, and then the Vulgate-Cycle was formed. Robert de Borron's *Joseph* was replaced by *Lestoire del Saint Graal*, but the *Merlin* remained intact. At this point *Le Livre d'Artus* was practically annihilated as a romance, for almost half of what was still left of it was suppressed and replaced by what now follows after the departure of Loth and his sons on their mission to the rebel kings.

As to the contents of this substitute, I have already stated that, with certain modifications, the mission of Loth and his sons to the rebel kings, their adventures on the road to the north, Gawain's fight with the Saxon king Clarion and the conquest of the latter's wonderful horse Gringalet, Gawain's meeting Eliezer the son of Pelles, and lastly the arrangement of a truce between Artus and

<sup>1</sup> In my *Vulgate-Version*, etc., Introduction p. viii, note 1, where I endorse the opinion expressed by Gaston Paris (*Romania*, vol. xii. pp. 459-534) that Chrestien's poem forms the basis of the version found in the *Lancelot*, I continue to state that I do not believe 'that Chrestien was the first to introduce "la liaison coupable de Lancelot et de Guenievre" into the Arthurian romances, for I hold that it had already been introduced by the writer of the *Lancelot*, who transferred to Lancelot the part played by Gosengos, or some other admirer of Guenevere, in the early history of Arthur known to him.' Now, considering that the *Lancelot* was written after *Le Livre d'Artus*, I think it not only possible but highly probable that Chrestien himself transferred the part of Gosengos to Lancelot.

<sup>2</sup> Conf. my *Vulgate Version*, etc., vol. i., Introduction p. xvii.

the rebels, must also have been told in the version which is represented by *Fragment II.* The account of the fighting of Artus, Ban, Bohort, and Loth side by side with the rebel kings, and the ultimate defeat of the latter in the substitute, has a very faint resemblance with what is told in *Fragment II.*, but the former is at most a very free and considerably shortened rendering of the latter. As to the rest, the substitute contains—first, incidents and episodes which are also, though very differently, told in *Fragment II.*, such as the visit of Ban and Bohort to the Castel des Mares and what happens there, and the birth of the sons of the kings Ban and Bohort; second, incidents and episodes which are not told there, but some of which, at least, may have been told in the last part of *Le Livre d'Artus*. To the last-named category belong the feast at Camaalot, the fighting between Artus and Rion before Carohaise, and the final defeat of Rion, the dream of Flualis, the episode of the damsel and the dwarf, and the war with the Romans; Artus's fight with the giant and the great cat, Gawain's transformation into a dwarf, the magic imprisonment of Merlin, and the quest of Merlin, etc. I am afraid it will never be possible to definitely state which of the incidents I enumerated may have figured in the earliest version of *Le Livre d'Artus*, for the very simple reason that not a single MS. is ever likely to be discovered shedding light on this point.

The *Lancelot*, also, was considerably changed. Certain adventures of Perceval were deleted. An account of the conception and birth of Galahad, of Lancelot's second frenzy, and of all that is connected with that event, of Agloval's visit to his mother, of Perceval's wish to become a knight of Artus's, of his arrival at court, of his quest of Lancelot, his meeting and fighting Hector, of their miraculous healing by the Holy Grail, of their finding Lancelot, of Lancelot's return to court, and of Galahad's infancy, was added. The prose-rendering of Chrestien's *Romans de la Charrete*, if it had not been already added to the *Lancelot*, when the *Joseph-Lancelot-Perceval-Cycle* was revised, with other material from *Le Livre d'Artus* was worked into the *Lancelot* at this time. The Perceval-Quest was replaced by a very careless version of the *Galahad-Quest*, and to make the connection between this and the last branch appear more intimate, the last paragraphs of the former were transferred to form the opening paragraphs of *La Mort Artu*, which, except for this change and a few references, remained intact.

To judge from the MSS., it is not improbable that, at least, Part II.<sup>1</sup> of the *Lancelot* was subjected to a further revision.

At the end of my repeatedly mentioned Introduction, pp. xxi-xxii, I state, in answer to the question: What was this account known to the writer of the *Lancelot*, with which he supposed his readers to be familiar? ‘It was a chronicle, a “Brut,” a romantic history of the British kings, in which Uterpandragon’s reign was more fully treated than in any other we know; in which Leodegan, the father of Guenever, played a part; in which the migration of the knights of the Round Table from “Carduel en Gales” to “Carohaise en Carmelide por la desloialte quil virent naistre en ce pais” was substantiated; in which Arthur’s birth and accession were not told as in Robert’s *Merlin*; in which the enchanter’s character had not yet undergone the transformation effected by Robert de Borron; and lastly, in which, besides many other features, the deeds of Ban and Bohort as Uterpandragon’s vassals were spoken of at some length, resembling in many respects those attributed to them in the capacity of Arthur’s vassals in the Vulgate-*Merlin*. We no longer possess this “Brut,” which was apparently later than Wace’s, and which was known to Chrestien de Troye, as is evident from his *Chevalier au Lion* and from several passages in his *Conte del Graal* and *Li Romans de la Charrete*; it is, however, quite possible that it was identical with the work referred to in the fifth *laisse* of most manuscripts of the *Lancelot* as “li contes des Bretes” or “li contes des bretes (sic) estoires,” and in the passage<sup>2</sup> which is inserted in several of the manuscripts of Robert’s *Merlin* joined to the Vulgate-*Merlin* (*i.e.* both being in these manuscripts branches of the Vulgate-Cycle) in the place of what Robert wrote.’

If I cannot here state this ‘Brut’ was *Le Livre d’Artus*, I am at least entitled to declare: If this ‘Brut’ was not part of *Le Livre d’Artus*, it must have formed its basis or source.

<sup>1</sup> Conf. my *Vulgate Version*, etc., *Le Livre de Lancelot*, Part II., vol. iv., the preliminary note and the appendix.

<sup>2</sup> The book is described ‘lystoire des rois bretons cest un livres que Martin de Bievre translata de latin en romans,’ *e.g.* in the MSS. Nos. 105 and 9123, in the former on fol. 133d, in the latter on fol. 103e. In the MS. No. 749, fol. 132, col. a, the book is styled: ‘lestoire de Bretaigne que on appelle Brutus que messire Martin de Rocester translata,’ etc. In the MS. C from which I have quoted *supra* in many places speaks of, ‘the storye of Bretons. That is a boke that maister Martyn translated . . .’

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to His Majesty  
at the Edinburgh University Press











